

6686. Also, petition of Maryland Lumber Co., of Baltimore, urging defeat of proposed duty of \$1.50 per thousand feet on lumber from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6687. By Mr. McFADDEN: Petition of residents of Wyoming County, Pa., petitioning the Congress to support the Robison-Capper school bill; to the Committee on Education.

6688. Also, petition of residents of Wyoming County, Pa., petitioning Congress to use every endeavor to secure speedy action on House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, providing for increased rates for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6689. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Apprentice National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 10343, limiting immigration into the United States, with special reference to Mexico; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6690. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Scabbard and Blade Twin City Alumni Post, Minnesota, favoring increased pay for the personnel of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6691. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Logan, W. Va., favoring legislation for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6692. By Mr. SPEAKS: Petition signed by 46 citizens of Columbus and Chillicothe, urging passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, proposing increased pension allowances to veterans of the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6693. By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the board of aldermen of the city of Somerville, Mass., in behalf of House Joint Resolution 167, to observe and commemorate the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6694. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Hogel Leetly, 9019 Bishop Street, Chicago, and other citizens of Cook County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6695. Also, petition of Alon E. Campbell, 2119 Ohio Street, Quincy, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6696. Also, petition of M. J. Ballestro, 4807 Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6697. Also, petition of W. L. McFetridge, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6698. Also, petition of Herman Fehling, 2629 Orchard Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6699. Also, petition of Mark Larsen, Elevator Operators and Starters' Union, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the seamen's bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6700. Also, petition of Eric Pihl, Carpenters and Joiners of America, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6701. Also, petition of John R. Ograin, 311 South Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6702. Also, petition of W. S. Leidig, 315 South Ashland Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6703. Also, petition of R. H. McDaniel, 209 West Jackson Boulevard, McKinlock Building, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6704. Also, petition of D. A. Manning, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6705. Also, petition of Elizabeth A. Grady, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6706. Also, petition of K. G. Eneborg, 400 South State Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6707. Also, petition of G. Daniels, 113 South Ashland Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress

of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6708. Also, petition of Casper Zeitler, jr., of Illinois, urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6709. Also, petition of H. E. Larson, Whiting, Ind., urging the immediate passage by Congress of House bill 9889, in regard to increase in pay for locomotive inspectors, and also the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6710. Also, petition of Floyd Long, 1206 East B Street, Belleville, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6711. Also, petition of James Loughridge, Local Union No. 9, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6712. Also, petition of Michael E. McCauley, 1010 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the La Follette bill (S. 306); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6713. Also, petition of Adelaide Hushaw and 23 other citizens of Industry, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of the Stalker House Joint Resolution 20; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6714. Also, petition of Ralph R. Pihl, Zion, Ill., urging the immediate passage by Congress of House bill 10290; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6715. Also, petition of S. Gorton, 1168 North Second Street, Springfield, Ill., urging the suspension of the rule and the passage of the Johnson bill (H. R. 10381); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

FRIDAY, April 11, 1930

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 8, 1930)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 3714) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River at Mount Carmel, Ill., and it was signed by the Vice President.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of John T. Cuppy, of Arizona, praying that he be heard before a subcommittee of the Senate "In re a matter of the Papago Pueblos: Consolidated Indian citizens and John T. Cuppy, citizen of the United States in and of the State of Arizona," which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WHEELER presented a resolution adopted by Farmers' Union, Local No. 367, of Dagmar, Mont., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the regular meeting of the Farmers' Union, Local No. 367, of Dagmar, Mont., held on April 1, 1930, the following resolution was read and unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it has been brought to our attention that the Federal Farm Board has made a further cut of 15 cents per bushel in the loan value on wheat; and

"Whereas this cut was made without ample notice to the growers; and

"Whereas the Farm Board had given the impression they would keep the former price of \$1.25 per bushel (based on Minneapolis) in effect until June 30, 1930, and the farmers have been persistently urged to withhold their wheat from the market and to keep it on their farms until the above date; and

"Whereas the above action by the Farm Board tends to break the confidence of the farmers in the farm marketing program: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we denounce such action as unfaithful to the wheat growers; and further be it

"Resolved, That the Farm Board give better assurances of fulfilling its promises in the future, and that more ample notice be given any future action of this nature; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Farm Board, the Senators and Representatives of our State, as well as to the Union Herald.

"EDGAR I. SYVERUD,
"NIELS C. SUNSTED,
"CARL HANSEN,
"Committee on Resolutions."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3531) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to enlarge tree-planting operations on national forests east of the Rocky Mountains, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 375) thereon.

Mr. HOWELL, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 328) for the relief of Edward C. Dunlap (Rept. No. 376); and

A bill (S. 968) for the relief of Anna Faceina (Rept. No. 377).

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3836) for the relief of David McD. Shearer, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 386) thereon.

Mr. NYE, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which were referred the following bills and joint resolution, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3934) granting certain lands in the city of Sault Ste. Marie, State of Michigan (Rept. No. 379);

A bill (S. 3960) to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the establishment of which is authorized by the act approved May 22, 1926 (44 Stats. 616) (Rept. No. 380);

A bill (H. R. 5619) to authorize the exchange of certain land now within the Lassen Volcanic National Park for certain private land adjoining the park and to adjust the park boundary accordingly, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 381);

A bill (H. R. 6121) to authorize the maintenance of central warehouses in national parks and national monuments and authorizing appropriations for the purchase of supplies and materials to be kept in said warehouses (Rept. No. 382);

A bill (H. R. 6809) to exempt from cancellation certain desert-land entries in Riverside County, Calif. (Rept. No. 383);

A bill (H. R. 9183) to provide for the exercise of sole and exclusive jurisdiction by the United States over the Hawaii National Park in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 384); and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 155) to provide for the naming of a prominent mountain or peak within the boundaries of Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, in honor of Carl Ben Eielson (Rept. No. 385).

Mr. NYE also, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6874) to authorize exchanges of lands with owners of private-land holdings within the Petrified Forest National Monument, Ariz., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 389) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 195) to facilitate the administration of the national parks by the United States Department of the Interior, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 393); and

A bill (S. 3477) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 388).

Mr. KENDRICK, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 2189) for the relief of certain stock-raising homestead entrymen in the State of Wyoming, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 390) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2865) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Wyoming and Idaho with respect to the boundary line between said States (Rept. No. 391); and

A bill (H. R. 3568) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to revise the north, northeast, and east boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park in the States of Montana and Wyoming, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1929, being Public Act No. 888 of the Seventieth Congress (Rept. No. 392).

Mr. SHEPPARD (for Mr. FLETCHER), from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4138) to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 387) thereon.

He also (for Mr. FLETCHER), from the same committee, to which was recommitteed the bill (H. R. 8527) to amend the act entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," approved March 2, 1929, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BROOKHART, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7414) to provide for a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 394) thereon.

REORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. COUZENS. From the Committee on Interstate Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 3619) to reorganize the Federal Power Commission, and I submit a report (No. 378) thereon. I will ask that this bill be brought up next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOWELL in the chair). The bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JONES (for Mr. NORRIS), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the nomination of William J. Carter, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney, eastern district of Tennessee, to succeed Everett Greer, resigned, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day, April 11, 1930, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3714) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River at Mount Carmel, Ill.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4141) granting an increase of pension to Eva S. Coe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 4142) to fix the salary of the Governor of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 4143) to amend an act entitled "An act making it a felony with penalty for certain aliens to enter the United States of America under certain conditions in violation of law," approved March 4, 1929; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 4144) to amend paragraph (4) of section 15 of the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. HAWES:

A bill (S. 4145) to amend the act approved May 15, 1928, entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4146) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings in Coalville, Utah, to the Summit County Fair Association, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 4147) making unlawful the shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of misbranded antiques, and imposing a penalty therefor; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4148) to provide for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in alleys in the District of Columbia, and for the replatting and development of squares containing inhabited alleys in the interest of public health, com-

fort, morals, safety, and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 4149) to add certain lands to the Ashley National Forest in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NYE (for Mr. SHIPSTEAD):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 166) to amend Public Resolution No. 80, Seventieth Congress, second session, relating to payment of certain claims of grain elevators and grain firms; to the Committee on Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Committee on the Library the bill (S. 1158) to provide for the erection of a monument, in the State of Oklahoma, at a point to be selected by the Secretary of War, to the memory of the soldiers of the War of 1812 who garrisoned the early forts and who died in the military service and who have been buried in the territory now comprising the State of Oklahoma.

The Committee on the Library is of the opinion that this bill should be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Concurring in that opinion, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Library be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on the Library will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill named by the Senator from Oklahoma, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CONSERVATION OF WILD ANIMAL LIFE

Mr. HAWES (for himself and Mr. WALCOTT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 246), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That a special committee of 5 Senators, to be composed of 3 members from the majority political party and 2 members from the minority political party, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed (1) to investigate all matters pertaining to the replacement and conservation of wild animal life (including aquatic and bird life) with a view to determining the most appropriate methods for carrying out such purposes, and (2) to report to the Senate as soon as practicable, but not later than the beginning of the first regular session of the Seventy-second Congress, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-first Congress until the final report is submitted, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$20,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

COURT-MARTIAL OF H. K. SABINS

Mr. TRAMMELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 247), which was ordered to lie over under the rule:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed (1) to investigate the alleged irregularities in connection with the summary court-martial and the proceedings of the court of inquiry in the case of H. K. Sabins, former yeoman, first class, United States Navy, which resulted in the issuance of a bad-conduct discharge to the said H. K. Sabins on September 23, 1929, and (2) to report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That 3,000 additional copies of House Document No. 328, Seventieth Congress, first session, entitled "Historical Statements Concerning the Battle of Kings Mountain and the Battle of the Cowpens in South Carolina," by Lieut. Col. H. L. Landers, be printed with illustrations and bound for the use of the Committee on Printing of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Messages in writing were communicated to the Senate from the President of the United States by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

RETIREMENT OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I have asked Mr. McReynolds to prepare a comparison of the Dale bill, the Lehlbach substitute, and the present law with reference to the retirement of Government employees. I think it is a very thorough statement of the situation. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, together with a table showing the annuities after 30 years or more of service and after 15 years of service. This will enable each Member of the Senate to get an accurate comparison of the three measures. I ask that the statement and the tables may be printed in the RECORD and ordered to lie on the table.

There being no objection, the statement and tables were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 10, 1930.

Memorandum for Senator BROOKHART:

Complying with your request of this morning I am submitting the following statement making a comparison of the provisions of the civil service retirement bill (S. 15) as it originally passed the Senate and as it passed the House of Representatives.

The original bill contained provisions materially modifying the present retirement law in the following respects:

1. Employees of the various classes are made eligible for retirement at their own option two years earlier than under the present law, although the normal and maximum retirement ages are left unchanged; that is, those now eligible for retirement at age 62 are permitted to retire at 60, those now retiring at 65 may retire at 63, and those now retiring at 70 may retire at 68. These same provisions are included in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives.

2. The retirement annuity is increased by providing that the annuity shall be computed by multiplying the average annual salary, not in excess of \$1,600 (changed from \$1,500 in the present law), received during the last five years by the number of years of service, not exceeding 30, and dividing the product by 40 (changed from 45 in the present law). This results in increasing the amount of allowable annuity by \$200 and fixing the maximum annuity at \$1,200 instead of \$1,000 as under the present law.

The provisions of the present law with respect to contributions by the employees of 3½ per cent of their pay, and the refund of these deductions to them or their estates in the case of withdrawal or death remain unchanged.

Stated generally, therefore, the original Dale bill leaves the present retirement system unchanged, but provides a somewhat higher retirement annuity under the system.

S. 15, as passed by the House of Representatives, provides an entirely different system of retirement benefits, with a view to eliminating certain inequities which result from the present system. The unfairness of the present system is illustrated by the following examples: (1) The employee who enters the service at age 40 and receives an average annual salary of \$1,600 for 30 years and retires at age 70 will have to his credit at retirement on account of deductions of 3½ per cent of his salary the sum of \$3,204.

The value of his annuity—that is, the amount of annuity that the average annuitant retiring at age 70 will draw at the annual rate of \$1,200 during his life—plus the amount that will be refunded to the estate of the annuitant who dies before his contributions have been exhausted will be \$8,975. The Government's contribution toward the annuity of such employee would be the excess of the value of the annuity over the amount of the contributions which the employee has to his credit at retirement; that is, \$5,771.

(2) The employee who enters the service at age 20 and receives the same average annual salary (\$1,600) for 50 years and retires at age 70 will have to his credit at retirement on account of deductions of 3½ per cent of his salary the sum of \$8,720. The value of his annuity—that is, the amount of annuity that the average annuitant retiring at age 70 will draw at the annual rate of \$1,200 during his life—plus the amount that will be refunded to the estate of the annuitant who dies before his contributions have been exhausted will be \$10,521. The Government's contribution toward the annuity of such employee would be the excess of the value of the annuity over the amount of the contributions which the employee has to his credit at retirement; that is, \$1,801.

(3) The employee who enters the service at age 40 and receives an average annual salary of \$6,000 for 30 years and retires at age 70 will have to his credit at retirement on account of deductions of 3½ per cent of his salary the sum of \$12,014. The value of his annuity—that is, the amount of annuity that the average annuitant retiring at age 70 will draw at the annual rate of \$1,200 during his life—plus the amount that will be refunded to the estate of the annuitant who dies before his contributions have been exhausted will be \$12,929. The Government's

contribution toward the annuity of such employee would be the excess of the value of the annuity over the amount of the contributions which the employee has to his credit at retirement; that is, \$915.

(4) The employee who enters the service at age 20 and receives an annual salary of \$6,000 for 50 years and retires at age 70 will have to his credit at retirement the sum of \$32,701. The value of his annuity will be \$32,701. The Government's contribution toward the annuity of such employee would, therefore, be nothing.

These illustrations show that under the retirement system provided by the original Dale bill, as between two employees who receive the same salary rates during their entire service, and who retire at the same age and at the same annuity rate, the Government will contribute more than three times as much toward the retirement benefits of the one as it does toward the other; and that for the higher paid employees with long service the Government not only makes no contribution whatever toward his retirement benefit but withholds from his pay several thousands of dollars more than is necessary to pay his annuity, which, although returned to his estate at death, he is unable to use during his lifetime.

The theory outlined in the retirement bill as it passed the House of Representatives is:

(a) That the Government's contributions toward retirement benefits shall be ultimately the same for all employees with comparable lengths of service regardless of the salary rates of those employees; and

(b) That the employees shall be permitted to supplement this uniform benefit by purchasing from the retirement fund such additional annuity as he is able to buy with the amount which he has to his credit at the time of retirement.

To assist the Government in financing its share of the retirement benefits the bill provides that an amount of \$1 a month shall be deducted from the contributions of each employee, and that this amount shall be placed to the credit of the fund and shall not be returned to any employee unless he shall be involuntarily separated from the service on account of reduction in force. This amount is also to be returned to the estates of employees who die prior to retirement. This will provide about three and one-half million dollars a year toward the Government's side of the annuity.

For the purpose of insuring that the annuity of those retiring during the next few years, while the amounts to the credits of employees is still relatively small, a provision was included that no annuity shall be less than that provided by the Dale bill as it passed the Senate.

Under the bill which passed the House of Representatives the annuities of retiring employees would be computed as follows:

1. Thirty dollars a year for each year of service not in excess of 30, to be paid for by the Government with the assistance of the \$1 a month contribution by each employee.

2. An indefinite amount to be purchased with the contributions to the credit of the employees at the time of retirement.

3. If the annuity provided under 1 and 2 is less than would be granted under the provisions of the bill which originally passed the Senate, the difference shall be added at the Government's expense.

The annuities which would be paid in the four cases cited above as illustrations would be as follows:

1. Employees with 30 years of service at average annual salaries of \$1,600	
Paid by Government and \$1 a month contributions of employees, 30 × 30	\$900
Paid by employees, \$2,517 ÷ 9.679	260
Paid by Government: Difference between original Dale bill annuity and the total of items 1 and 2	40
Total annuity	1,200
2. Employees with 50 years of service at average annual salary of \$1,600	
Paid by Government and \$1 a month contributions of employees, 30 × 30	\$900
Paid by employees, \$6,851 ÷ 9.679	707
Total annuity	1,607
3. Employees with 30 years of service at average annual salary of \$6,000	
Paid by Government and \$1 a month contributions of employees, 30 × 30	\$900
Paid by employees, \$11,327 ÷ 9.679	1,170
Total annuity	2,070
4. Employees with 50 years of service at average annual salary of \$6,000	
Paid by Government and \$1 a month contributions of employees, 30 × 30	\$900
Paid by employees, \$30,833 ÷ 9.679	3,185
Total annuity	4,085

It will be observed that under the bill as it passed the House of Representatives the annuity provided by the Government and the \$1 a month employees' contributions is identical in all cases, although the amount of annuity purchased with the contributions to the credit of the employee at retirement varies, according to the amount actually contributed, from \$260 to \$3,185, while under the original Dale bill the total annuity is identical in all cases (\$1,200), and the Government's contribution toward that amount ranges from \$5,771, or about \$800 a year to nothing.

The total cost to the Government of the annuities which would be paid under the system provided by the bill as it passed the House of Representatives would be approximately \$3,000,000 a year greater than the cost under the original Dale bill as it passed the Senate.

The optional retirement benefit authorized under the last proviso in section 4 of the bill as it passed the House of Representatives permits the employee to purchase an annuity under an agreement that any unused contributions at time of death of the annuitant shall be forfeited to the fund. This will result in a somewhat greater annuity being paid during the life of the annuitant, but the total amount withdrawn from the fund will be the same, because if the smaller annuity is paid the balance goes to the annuitant's estate.

Approximate annuities under S. 15 after 50 or more years of service—To employees who entered prior to August 1, 1920

Year of retirement	Average salary during contributing period									
	\$840 ¹	\$900 ¹	\$1,080 ¹	\$1,500 ¹	\$2,000	\$2,500	\$3,000	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$6,000
Retired at age 58; average retirement age (disability):										
1930	865	927	933	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
1935	880	943	953	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,219
1940	897	962	977	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,220	1,303	1,386
1945	918	985	1,006	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,234	1,352	1,471	1,589
1950	943	1,013	1,042	1,125	1,200	1,271	1,352	1,514	1,675	1,837
1955	974	1,047	1,085	1,175	1,282	1,389	1,496	1,710	1,924	2,138
1960	1,012	1,088	1,138	1,255	1,394	1,533	1,671	1,949	2,227	2,504
Retired at age 63 (62 group):										
1930	870	932	938	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
1935	886	950	962	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,210	1,274
1940	906	972	990	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,275	1,373	1,470
1945	931	999	1,024	1,125	1,200	1,222	1,292	1,431	1,570	1,709
1950	961	1,032	1,066	1,146	1,241	1,336	1,431	1,620	1,810	1,999
1955	997	1,072	1,117	1,223	1,349	1,474	1,600	1,851	2,102	2,353
1960	1,041	1,121	1,180	1,316	1,479	1,642	1,805	2,131	2,457	2,783
Retired at age 68 (65 group):										
1930	876	939	946	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
1935	896	961	975	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,275	1,352
1940	920	988	1,009	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,235	1,353	1,471	1,590
1945	950	1,020	1,050	1,125	1,205	1,289	1,373	1,542	1,710	1,878
1950	986	1,060	1,101	1,197	1,312	1,427	1,541	1,771	2,000	2,229
1955	1,030	1,108	1,163	1,290	1,442	1,594	1,746	2,049	2,353	2,656
1960	1,083	1,167	1,238	1,404	1,601	1,798	1,994	2,388	2,782	3,176
Retired at age 73 (70 group):										
1930	884	947	956	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,213
1935	908	974	991	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,263	1,356	1,450
1940	938	1,005	1,032	1,125	1,200	1,236	1,308	1,451	1,595	1,738
1945	974	1,046	1,083	1,169	1,271	1,373	1,475	1,680	1,884	2,089
1950	1,018	1,094	1,145	1,262	1,401	1,540	1,680	1,958	2,237	2,516
1955	1,071	1,153	1,220	1,375	1,559	1,744	1,928	2,297	2,666	3,035
1960	1,136	1,225	1,311	1,512	1,751	1,991	2,230	2,709	3,188	3,667
Dale bill	630	675	810	1,125	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Existing law	560	600	720	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000

¹ Assuming that the average salaries during the five years of service next preceding retirement are \$840, \$900, \$1,080, and \$1,500, respectively. The final salaries would, of course, generally exceed the average for the entire contributing period.

Approximate annuities under H. R. 9679 after 15 years of service

Year of retirement	Average salary during contributing period									
	\$840	\$900	\$1,080	\$1,500	\$2,000	\$2,500	\$3,000	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$6,000
Age 58:										
1930.....	475	477	483	562	600	600	600	600	601	631
1935 ¹	490	493	503	562	600	600	606	660	715	769
Age 63:										
1930.....	480	482	488	562	600	600	600	600	627	663
1935 ¹	496	500	512	562	600	602	634	697	760	824
Age 68:										
1930.....	486	489	496	562	600	600	600	622	664	707
1935 ¹	506	511	525	562	600	633	672	749	825	902
Age 73:										
1930.....	494	497	506	562	600	600	606	658	711	763
1935 ¹	518	524	541	580	626	673	720	813	906	1,000
Dale bill.....	315	338	405	562	600	600	600	600	600	600
Existing law.....	280	300	360	500	500	500	500	500	500	500

¹ The fund will have been in operation 15 years on August 1, 1935. The annuities under H. R. 9679 for those retiring after 15 years of service will reach their ultimate level at that time, since all such retired employees will have contributed for their entire period of service.

JOHN J. RASKOB BEFORE THE LOBBY COMMITTEE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Star of April 4, 1930, giving an account of John J. Raskob's appearance before the lobby committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Star, April 4, 1930]

WET STAND IS NOT LINKED WITH PARTY WORK, SAYS RASKOB—DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN SMILES AS SENATORS TILT AT LOBBY INVESTIGATION—ROBINSON ASKS LEADER IF HE PLANS TO RESIGN—WITNESS TESTIFIES HE GAVE \$64,000 TO ASSOCIATION IN 5-YEAR PERIOD.

Smiling calmly while Senate lobby committee members engaged in heated quarrels among themselves, John J. Raskob to-day denied that his activities as a director of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment were mixed with his work as chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Raskob testified that he had contributed \$64,000 to the association over a period of five years, but added that he was careful not to mix his personal beliefs on prohibition in the affairs of the Democratic National Committee. He asserted that "no one can commit the Democratic Party on the liquor question except the national convention."

M'BRIDE AT HEARING

The committee room was packed as Raskob began his testimony, with three members of the committee, ROBINSON of Indiana, Republican, and Chairman CARAWAY, of Arkansas, and WALSH of Montana, Democrats, present. F. Scott McBride, superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League, was standing in the back of the room as first WALSH and then ROBINSON questioned the Democratic leader.

From the beginning the Democrats and Republicans tilted over questions that ROBINSON put to Raskob, and finally all three joined in warm exchanges after the Indiana Senator asked Raskob if he intended to resign the Democratic chairmanship in response to a suggestion made by Josephus Daniels in his North Carolina newspaper.

The question went unanswered after CARAWAY and WALSH vehemently protested that it was irrelevant.

ROBINSON insisted the same question had been asked Claudius Huston, chairman of the Republican National Committee, before the lobby committee. Disputing this, Senator WALSH shouted, "It makes no difference; we are not going to transform this hearing into a show."

Daniels, Navy Secretary in the Wilson Cabinet, had attacked Raskob for his membership in the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment while holding the post of Democratic chairman.

The clashes between the committee members continued throughout the hearing. At one point CARAWAY said to the spectators:

"Don't laugh, this is Senator ROBINSON's show."

Raskob said he took no part in the work of the association other than to look over its reports occasionally as a director. He testified that its activities were centered in the election of wet Members of Congress rather than in the "persuasion of those in Congress."

After the hearing Chairman CARAWAY announced that William H. Stayton, of Washington, chairman of the board of directors of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, would be called by the committee for questioning.

ANSWERS BRING LAUGHTER

The crowded committee room frequently resounded with laughter as Raskob, always smiling, shot back "yes" or "no" answers to Senator ROBINSON.

After the committee session newspaper men asked Raskob if he had any objection to answering the Robinson question. He replied that he had none. He asserted he had no intention of resigning.

Asked by CARAWAY if he had hopes of repeal of the eighteenth amendment, Raskob replied he had some hopes "of modification at least."

Raskob testified that the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment was a bipartisan organization and named as members W. W. Atterbury, Republican national committeeman for Pennsylvania, and Charles H. Sabin, husband of the former Republican national committeewoman for New York.

OPENING TESTIMONY

Chairman CARAWAY asked the perfunctory opening questions, inquiring as to Raskob's occupation.

The witness replied "Executive."

"Of what?" Chairman CARAWAY continued.

Raskob said of the Du Pont Co.

CARAWAY asked his relation to the Association Against Prohibition.

"I don't know the full name of it," the Arkansas Senator added.

Raskob said he was a director of the association and had been for five years.

"Its purpose is to attempt by education to convince the people of the United States that the eighteenth amendment ought to be repealed," Raskob asserted.

"Have you much hope?" asked CARAWAY.

Raskob laughed before he answered, "Yes; I think I have a great deal of hope that we are making progress toward modification."

The Democratic chairman said he contributed \$12,500 in 1928, \$30,000 in 1929, and had pledged \$30,000 for 1930. Part of the year's amount already has been paid, he added.

Other contributions, he said, were made before 1928.

Raskob read a list of the names of men composing the board of the association.

"I note some Irish names on it, and I judge it is bipartisan," remarked Chairman CARAWAY.

"Yes; I think there are more Republicans than Democrats on it," added Raskob with a laugh.

"There usually are on election day, anyway," put in CARAWAY.

Included in the list of directors was the name of James W. Wadsworth, former Republican Senator from New York.

CARAWAY asked Raskob if he had seen Members of Congress in regard to their views on prohibition since he became a director.

"No," said the witness.

Senator WALSH asked the names of other contributors to the association, but Raskob said he did not know them, aside from Pierre S. du Pont, of Delaware.

Senator WALSH asked the extent of Raskob's participation in the association.

"I am not active," Raskob explained. "I am largely in the position of a contributor. As a director I attend some meetings to hear reports."

INQUIRIES ABOUT CHARTS

Replying to WALSH, the witness said the association was interested in the election of wet Members to Congress, but that he had not taken part in such a campaign.

Senator WALSH asked about the charts giving statistics on liquor conditions hung on the Senate walls recently by Senator TYDINGS, Democrat, Maryland. TYDINGS is a wet.

Raskob said he didn't know where the charts came from, but he said the association "is making an honest effort to ascertain the facts and is reducing these facts to charts."

Under persistent inquiry by WALSH, Mr. Raskob said he had never been interested in the manufacture of liquor, and, so far as he knew, none of those connected with the association were interested now, as in the past, in the manufacture of liquor.

Replying again to WALSH, the witness said that the interest of the association was in the election of wets to Congress, "rather than the persuasion of those in Congress."

Raskob identified W. W. Atterbury, Republican national committeeman for Pennsylvania, and Charles W. Sabin, husband of the former Republican national committeewoman from New York, as directors of the Association Against Prohibition.

Raskob said he was careful not to mix his personal beliefs on prohibition in the affairs of the Democratic National Committee.

"I have no right to commit the Democratic Party on either side of the prohibition question," he asserted, adding, "My opinion is that no one can commit the Democratic Party on this question except the national convention. I shall not try to influence any Democratic Member on this question."

FAVORS MODIFICATION

Senator ROBINSON, Republican, Indiana, then took up the questioning. "When was the association organized?"

"I don't know."

"You were a contributor, why don't you know?" came back ROBINSON. "Well, I don't," answered Raskob.

"Do you favor repeal or modification of prohibition?" asked ROBINSON. "I do, or at least modification."

The Indiana Senator then clashed with Raskob over the location of the headquarters of the association. Raskob insisted the main offices were in New York and ROBINSON contended that literature of the association named Washington as headquarters.

The subject was dropped after Raskob said he met as a director with other directors of the association in New York.

The Democratic chairman testified he was no longer active in the Du Pont Co., although he was a vice president. Senator ROBINSON brought up this point by referring to an old speech by Senator HARRISON, Democrat, Mississippi, stating that Raskob was not active with the Du Pont corporation.

CARAWAY AND ROBINSON CLASH

Chairman CARAWAY and Senator ROBINSON engaged in a brief tilt after ROBINSON questioned Raskob about a recent statement attributed to Senator HARRISON, that Raskob was no longer an officer of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Raskob explained he was a vice president of the company, but said the position was largely honorary.

CARAWAY asked ROBINSON what Senator HARRISON's statement had to do with the inquiry.

"It will have a great deal to do with it," ROBINSON retorted.

"Then we'll get HARRISON before the committee," countered CARAWAY.

"Some of them we can't get," ROBINSON shot back, referring to Senator KING, Democrat, Utah, who is in Europe.

"Yes; and he went there with your consent," CARAWAY said.

"I didn't know anything about him going," ROBINSON insisted.

"Then GEORGE MOSES [Republican Senator from New Hampshire] is utterly unreliable," CARAWAY retorted, adding:

"He told me you did."

ROBINSON reiterated that he knew nothing about KING's departure until after he had left.

KING, who has been ill for several months, went to Europe for his health. It was testified before the committee that H. A. Metz, of New York, chemical importer, had contributed \$1,000 in 1922 and \$1,000 in 1928 to the Senator's campaign fund.

KING has denied knowledge of the 1922 contribution and said the 1928 fund was not used.

RASKOB DENIES LOBBYING

Raskob denied that the association was a lobbying organization.

"Of course, I don't know the correct definition of lobbying," he added.

ROBINSON read from association literature that "the fundamental purpose of the association is to take the eighteenth amendment out of the Constitution."

"That's right," said Raskob.

"That's what I wanted to know."

Raskob said his contribution of \$30,000 to the association in 1928 was made prior to his becoming chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Senator WALSH broke in at this point and insisted that Senator ROBINSON permit the witness to answer questions.

"I am the judge of whether he answers," shot back ROBINSON.

"Well, let him answer," returned WALSH.

Raskob denied the accuracy of an interview published in the Philadelphia Public Ledger during the last presidential campaign in which he was quoted as saying he wanted "to get rid of this damnable affliction of prohibition."

Another tilt took place between ROBINSON and WALSH when the Indianan asked Raskob:

"Did you think in accepting the position of Democratic chairman that you could serve the cause of repealing the prohibition amendment?"

"That question is wholly irrelevant," WALSH put in.

ROBINSON insisted that the question be answered and WALSH retorted:

"I don't like to see this inquiry into lobbying diverted into wholly irrelevant questions."

"No," Senator ROBINSON retorted, "this inquiry has never been directed into political questions."

WALSH again said the question of Raskob's motive in accepting the position of Democratic chairman had no part in the hearing, and finally ROBINSON withdrew the question.

As questioning continued, F. Scott McBride, general counsel for the Anti-Saloon League, stood with the crowd near the back door.

Raskob said he did not know about the expenditures of the association.

DID NOT KNOW PLANS

ROBINSON asked him about plans of the association, but the witness again said he did not know about them.

"As a prudent business man you wouldn't spend \$66,000 on something you didn't know anything about, would you?" persisted ROBINSON.

"No," answered the witness.

"What did you spend this money for?"

"For the purposes to which I have testified," Raskob answered.

Raskob smiled as laughter broke out in the crowd at his abrupt answers to ROBINSON, who asked his questions in a loud voice.

Persisting, ROBINSON asked Raskob if he knew how much money was spent by the association last year.

"I don't know," the witness replied.

"Would it surprise you to learn \$468,000 was spent last year?" ROBINSON continued.

"I have no knowledge of it," Raskob answered evenly.

A sharp tilt came after ROBINSON asked Raskob if he intended to resign as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Both CARAWAY and WALSH objected immediately and refused to let the witness answer.

MET DANIELS ONCE

Shooting a rapid fire of questions at the witness, ROBINSON asked Raskob if he knew Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy in the Wilson Cabinet.

"I met him once," Raskob said.

"Was he ever the Democratic national committeeman from North Carolina?" ROBINSON inquired.

"I don't know," Raskob answered.

ROBINSON appeared surprised that Raskob did not know.

CARAWAY then demanded that ROBINSON give the year.

"I don't know," ROBINSON replied.

The packed committee room broke into an uproar, and CARAWAY commented:

"This is Senator ROBINSON's show. Now, don't laugh at it."

"I'm not versed in the affairs of the Democratic Party," ROBINSON explained.

WALSH HALTS ANSWER

ROBINSON asked the question after reading an editorial in the newspaper published by Daniels in Raleigh, N. C., condemning Raskob for serving as a director on the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment while chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

"Don't answer that," shouted Senator WALSH.

"That is the same sort of question that was asked Claudius Huston, chairman of the Republican National Committee, on this stand the other day when I was not here," retorted ROBINSON.

"We are not going to transform this into a show," replied Senator WALSH. "I advise Mr. Raskob he does not have to answer that question. The Senator can appeal to the Senate."

CARAWAY DENIES QUESTION

Chairman CARAWAY denied that Huston had been asked by the committee if he would resign.

"It makes no difference," Senator WALSH said loudly. "I don't think Mr. Huston was asked such a question. This question to Mr. Raskob is wholly irrelevant to this inquiry."

ROBINSON called for the record of the hearings on Huston to look for the question to which he referred.

The excitement subsided as ROBINSON changed the questioning.

Raskob sat calmly by as CARAWAY and WALSH battled with ROBINSON. All three Senators were talking at the same time during part of the exchange.

Finally, Raskob said, "I don't believe, Senator ROBINSON, that you want to understand my answers."

TRIED TO EXPLAIN

"I have tried to make it clear how I have spent this money," he added. "I am willing to contribute the money I have to be spent by these men. I have confidence in them. Naturally, any executive would leave the matters of details to the officers of the company."

Raskob then again denied that his activities as chairman of the Democratic National Committee and as a director of the Association Against the Eighteenth Amendment were intertwined.

"I asked that, because this serious charge has been made by a leader of the party, Josephus Daniels," said ROBINSON.

CARAWAY said, "Don't answer that."

The hearing was interrupted by the arrival of William Tyler Page, the Clerk of the House, with the reports filed by the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment of its receipts and expenditures.

In answer to a question by ROBINSON, Raskob said he had spoken to no one about the rayon schedule in the tariff bill.

NEVER HEARD REPORTS

"Are you familiar with reports that you organized a lobby on the rayon schedule?" inquired ROBINSON.

"Never heard of it," replied Raskob.

Raskob said the Du Pont corporation had a rayon subsidiary company. He said he had no stock in these companies.

Senator ROBINSON read a letter signed "Gertrude M. Duncan," calling attention to "reports" of a rayon lobby with which prominent Democrats were reported to be connected. The letter mentioned Joseph Tumulty, Lieutenant Governor Lehman, of New York, and Representative CELLER, of New York.

Raskob reiterated that he had never heard of the lobby.

Chairman CARAWAY asked Senator ROBINSON if he wished to inquire into the rayon lobby.

"I believe we should," replied the Indiana Senator.

Raskob was then dismissed as a witness.

THE OREGON TRAIL—RADIO ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio address delivered last night at St. Louis by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], entitled "The Covered Wagon," on the occasion of the opening of the nation-wide celebration for the Oregon Trail Memorial Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the frontier spirit, typified by the covered wagon, you have just heard the kind words of my friend, CHARLES McNARY, senior Senator from Oregon.

Senator McNARY is of original pioneer stock. His grandfather crossed the old trail in a covered wagon in 1845. The Senator is a leader in the United States Senate, popular in Oregon and throughout the Nation.

Senator McNARY is the author of the bill which gave the Oregon trail its official name, preserving for the future the traditions of those sturdy pioneers who 100 years ago to-day, April 10, set out to face the hazards of adventure and to carry the vanguard of American home seekers across the virgin fields and forests of the unexplored West.

It is my pleasant duty, as a Senator from Missouri, where the Oregon Trail began, on behalf of the Oregon Trail Memorial Association, to respond to an official approval by the Congress and a proclamation by President Hoover.

We begin to-day, in St. Louis, to commemorate the beginning of the trail. My brief remarks will be confined to the times of 1830. As this celebration will extend to December, you may later hear Senator McNARY commemorating the conclusion of the great adventure.

Along the route of this historic trail, between the first speech to-night and the last next December, there will be meetings, parades, and demonstrations. School children, Boy Scouts, the American Legion, War Mothers, and patriotic and civic organizations will tell again the story of the home seekers crossing the plains and deserts, fording streams, scaling mountains, and fighting Indians; all the while braving shortage of food, sickness, and death.

We are, in fact, blazing a new trail of inspiration and patriotism, lighting a way for another 100 years.

Smith, Jackson, and Sublette did it a century ago under trying circumstances; our effort will be to recall their spirit and emulate it.

Later, as we follow the trail of 1930, different speakers will give you the names and tell you the story of other men, especially of Ezra Meeker, Jim Bridger, and Kit Carson.

I can refer to only three: Members of the trapper firm of Smith, Jackson & Sublette.

The old Missouri Republican of that year states that they engaged 70 men and had 10 heavy wagons; that it was the design to proceed the whole distance with wagons, a means of transportation never before used in expeditions to that country.

Then, on October 7, the St. Louis Beacon reports that Messrs. Smith and Jackson had just returned from the Rocky Mountains; that they had done well and brought in a large quantity of furs which richly rewarded them for their perils. They brought back 190 packs of beaver skins.

So large a wagon train and such a great quantity of valuable furs had never before been brought from the mountains. Their arrival in St. Louis created a sensation.

Over the mantelpiece in my study is a painting by Berninghaus, the Missouri artist who specialized in frontier life. It is called the Home Seekers. A Conestoga covered wagon fills the foreground, moving over a prairie trail.

The powerful wagon with its familiar canvas cover, the straining horses, the great expanse of territory, all portrayed in the brilliant colors of our favorite artist, has long been an inspiration to me. It tells anew the story of the West, of hardships, of patriotism, and real freedom.

The covered wagon was built for strength and defense. Of sturdy construction, with broad steel tires, it traveled over a trackless country, forded streams, climbed mountains, and often through clouds of dust, with hostile Indians watching for the stragglers. With little water or food aboard, it went rolling, lurching, struggling on, stopping only for birth or death along the roadside, carrying its pioneers and building deep the foundation of American civilization for generations to come.

We must remember that at this date Arkansas was only a defined territory; that foreign powers owned all that section of our country now occupied by the States of Texas, Arizona, Nevada, Oklahoma, California, New Mexico, Utah, and part of Colorado. The only State west of the Mississippi River was 9-year old Missouri, and the vast area occupied now by the States of Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana, was unorganized territory.

The Oregon territory itself extended up into what are now the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and the western portion of Montana.

To fully realize the significance of this trail and the hazards it presented, it must be remembered that these pioneers set out in their wagons across an area of undeveloped country as large as France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Denmark, and Belgium.

To-day, as we travel on inflated rubber tires supported on finely adjusted springs, with shock absorbers as aids to comfort, over smooth macadam roads and scientifically constructed bridges, and with thermos bottles of ice water, or a radio picking music from the air, let us try to quickly visualize the United States in 1830, with a total population of some 12,500,000 people, of whom 2,300,000 were slaves.

The center of population was in a small town in West Virginia. The Black Hawk War was fomenting in which, strange to say, Abraham Lincoln served as a captain and Jefferson Davis as a lieutenant.

I have always wished that Lincoln and Davis might have continued to fight Indians and have never fought each other.

In the year when the trailers set out for Oregon, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad (America's first railroad) had just built its first 24 miles of track; Robert E. Lee was graduating from West Point; James A. Garfield (the twentieth President), was born; and James Monroe (the fifth President) died. A free-trade convention opened in Philadelphia and a high-tariff convention began in New York.

Settlers were planning to lay out Chicago.

Andrew Jackson, "Old Hickory," was President of the United States, and John C. Calhoun, his bitter enemy, was Vice President.

When Smith, Jackson, and Sublette returned from their adventure they wrote a description of their trip to Secretary of War Eaton, who had married that fascinating Peggy O'Neill. President Jackson's defense of Mrs. Eaton nearly caused the disruption of his Cabinet, and because Van Buren was the only member besides her husband who defended her he became a favorite, this being one of the main reasons for his election as President of the United States.

So, in this year 1830, there were not only interesting but spicy events which at various times brought all of the West and the Northwest and much of the South and the East to gossip at the little settlement of St. Louis.

Through the Louisiana Purchase by Jefferson in 1804 this western territory became part of the United States, and Missouri made application for admission to the Union in 1818.

After three years of bitter national controversy, resulting in what is called the Missouri compromise, Missouri was admitted to Statehood only nine years before the movement to perfect the Oregon Trail was started.

And it was about in this same year that the Mormons' western settlement was founded near Independence, Mo.

Around the admission of Missouri were fought the first great political battles between protection and free trade and between slavery and abolition.

Statesmen with long vision anticipated the development of the West and the Northwest, knowing that new States would be carved out of this great unexplored territory, which States when admitted to the Union would upset the balance of power.

The Missouri compromise suggested by Henry Clay prevailed, but this compromise involved the precedent for congressional exclusion of slavery from public territory.

What of the little trading post, St. Louis, named for a French king? Situated on the mighty Mississippi River near the junction of the Missouri, not far from the mouth of the Illinois, it had the canoe and river transportation for nearly 1,000 miles due north and nearly 1,000 miles northwest; and just to the south there entered the great Ohio, a water highway that brought the seacoast colonists down that stream.

So they came from New York and New England, from Pennsylvania and old Virginia, and then to the far South the father of waters found its way to the Gulf and the old city of New Orleans, and up the river came the pioneers of the Gulf Coast States.

At various times St. Louis had flying over it the flags of Spain, France, England, and the United States.

I read an original letter from the good bishop of Bardstown, Ky., deposited in the archives of old Ste. Genevieve, in which he said after his visit to the village of St. Louis that it was a wicked place, where there was a playhouse and that people danced.

I wonder what the bishop would say of the same city and its early settlers if he could look in to-night at the Coronado Hotel, where patriotic citizens are meeting to extol the virtues and valor of the Oregon Trail pioneers?

Even back in 1830 St. Louis was a cosmopolitan center; it was the meeting place of the fur traders and trappers, of the alligator horses who came down the Ohio and up the Mississippi, called "alligator horses" because they wielded long oars on the river barges. Men from the farthest north and the farthest south bartered their goods here. It was the pivot, the hub, of the Central West.

Here Aaron Burr plotted with General Wilkinson for a western empire. It was the beginning of what we sometimes call the western trail and, while this is geographically correct, it is said that historically it is the end of the eastern trail; for, at the beginning, the far West was only a transplanted East. Here there blended both the North and the South and the East. The pathfinders came from every State east of the Mississippi.

St. Louis, Independence, and St. Joseph are Missouri's contribution to the start of the great western trails.

St. Joseph became especially noted as the home of the pony express, where began the fastest horse service in the delivery of mail in the history of the world.

The picture of the day is word painted in some lines from the poem, *The Oregon Trail*:

"From East and South and North they flock, to muster row on row,
A fleet of ten-score prairie ships besides Missouri's flow.
The bull whips crack, the oxen strain, the canvas-hooded files
Are off upon the long, long trail of sixteen hundred miles.
The women hold the guiding lines; beside the rocking steers
With goad and ready rifle walk the bearded pioneers."

One hundred years ago to-day, Jedediah S. Smith, William L. Sublette, and David E. Jackson organized a caravan, taking with them 10 covered wagons and 2 Dearborns, and demonstrated for the first time that a round trip to the Pacific coast could be made in six months. Their wagons did not come back empty. They were filled with \$150,000 in furs for the greatest fur market in all the West, as it is to-day, the greatest fur market in all the world—St. Louis.

Time will not permit telling the complete story of these three men; their personal appearance; their exploits and adventures, only reference to their departure was chronicled in the little newspapers of the day, and of their triumphant return.

Many started on that western trip across the plains and mountains who never came back, and there were some who spent more than two years in making the trip.

But this St. Louis expedition made the round trip in six months. That was the significant, the appealing thought which inspired the Nation and started the great march across the plains through the hospitable door of St. Louis.

Men would no longer be required to go to sea, suffer the rigors of Cape Horn, and circle the North and South American seacoasts to reach the western coast of America.

These three men, setting out from St. Louis, demonstrated that it could be done in six months.

May I be pardoned a little home pride in saying that it was the "spirit of St. Louis" in 1830 that guided the pioneers of the Oregon Trail, just as it was the *Spirit of St. Louis* that took Lindbergh over a new trail across 3,000 miles of sea.

It is estimated that 350,000 covered wagons followed across the 2,000-mile trail between St. Louis and Oregon City. Estimates of the deaths on the trail vary from 10,000 to 20,000.

It is difficult at this time to measure the importance of the achievement of these three men. We must go far back in history to make it clear.

Spain, at one time the great maritime power, had early colonized in South America, built settlements upon the Pacific coast, and even controlled many islands in the Pacific. The Philippines, one of our dependencies to-day, were under its control for over 300 years before Dewey brought release.

All the old sea captains believed that there existed a northern water passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans, and the Spanish, Portuguese, and English explorers made many voyages of discovery. But the water route was never changed until American genius built the Panama Canal.

The Spanish took the gold from the south and from the islands of the east, and then Sir Francis Drake took Spanish ships and Spanish gold

in the early days, and he, too, tried to find the northern passage for the return of his prizes, but the fabled passage was not there; the Pacific could be reached only by the long voyage around Cape Horn until the covered wagon found the way across and brought eastern and western North America into contact through a land route.

It was not until 39 years later, in 1869, that a golden spike united iron rails from East and West, and the covered wagon, having played its part in history, passed into memory.

It is to preserve the story of their achievement that we meet in St. Louis to-night, with the hope that its retelling will make us better men and women.

When our settlers reached the great northwest country and Oregon, a national dispute between Spain and the United States had been followed by a boundary discussion between the United States and Great Britain. It is said that when men arrived there the query was first, "Did you come over the plains, cross the Isthmus, or go around the Horn?"

At this time was heard the national aspiration proclaimed in the famous phrase, "Fifty-four forty or fight."

The covered wagon, by its settlement, won the boundary fight, and Oregon and that wonderful territory was won for the United States.

Over 250 years of fruitless maritime effort was ended, and a boundary dispute which might have brought war was settled by the trappers who left St. Louis 100 years ago to-day to link the East and the West.

Old Ezra Meeker, a pioneer of the Northwest who founded the Oregon Trail Memorial Association, has passed away. He is succeeded by Howard R. Driggs, George P. Pratt, Lorne W. Barclay, and J. C. Rochester, of New York; by Julius F. Stone, of Columbus, Ohio; and E. D. Nims, of our city of St. Louis.

We start to-day with these men to follow Smith, Jackson, and Sublette in spirit. We shall cross with them in imagination the old unbroken trail. We will keep alive their memories and the traditions of their times and try to preserve their spirit, their courage.

May the lights burn bright along the new trail, and may the voices of Americans in 1930, in speech and prayer, unite in this memorial for the heroic men and women, the frontier home builders of 1830.

WORLD COURT SENTIMENT IN MONTANA

MR. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the *RECORD* a statement of Mrs. E. K. Bowman with reference to a survey she has made as to sentiment in Montana on the World Court.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

MONTANA BUSINESS MEN FOR WORLD COURT

Ninety-five per cent of the men interviewed and those voting by mail favor entrance of the United States into the World Court. Mrs. E. K. Bowman, of the League of Women Voters, has been making a canvass of persons who represent the public opinion of the State and these are the justified conclusions.

Preferential vote has been taken of over 250 professional and business men throughout the State. About 50 per cent of these men are lawyers and the rest of the group are bankers, editors, legislators, and men from farm labor and various trade groups. The list following is hurriedly gathered and could be increased many times:

J. E. Erickson, Governor of Montana; Lew L. Callaway, chief justice supreme court; Col. A. J. Galen, justice supreme court; John A. Mathews, justice supreme court; S. C. Ford, justice supreme court; A. H. Angstman, justice supreme court; Frank Hazelbaker, lieutenant governor, Dillon; Maj. L. A. Foot, attorney general; George W. Porter, State auditor; M. A. Brannon, chancellor Montana University; S. V. Stewart, former governor; I. M. Brandjord, commissioner of State lands; J. C. Lyndes, State land office; T. J. Walsh, United States Senator; W. A. Campbell, editor Helena Independent; Charles Reifensrath, business manager *Record Herald*; Rev. Wallace E. Brown, bishop Helena area, Methodist Episcopal; Right Rev. William Faber, bishop Episcopal Church; E. C. Day, Scottish Rite; Col. G. I. Reiche, patriotic instructor State Grand Army of the Republic; Herbert Kibler, Montana American Legion; Right Rev. N. C. Hoff, president Mount St. Charles College; James D. Graham, president Montana Federation of Labor; F. W. Mettler, attorney; E. G. Toomey, attorney; Ray Nagle, attorney; R. J. Cunningham, secretary Montana Educational Association; Norman Winestine, treasurer New York Store; Lester Loble, attorney; Frank Bogart, Union Bank & Trust Co.; Joseph M. Dixon, former governor, Missoula; Hon. John M. Evans, United States Congressman; W. H. Beacom, mayor of Missoula; Albert Besancon, attorney, Missoula; Dr. Asa Willard, osteopath physician, Missoula; Glenn W. Prether, manager Golden Rule Store, Missoula; S. J. Coffee, president Missoula Drug Co.; Howard Green, banker, Missoula; Asa L. Duncan, judge, Missoula; John E. Patterson, judge, Missoula; Dean Leaphart, law school, Missoula; Dwight Mason, county attorney, Missoula; Ralph Arnold, attorney, Missoula; S. G. Skulason, attorney, Missoula; Walter Pope, attorney, Missoula; C. H. Clapp, president Montana University, Missoula; Dr. George M. Jennings, N. P. surgeon, Missoula; Alfred Atkinson, president Montana State College, Bozeman; I. W.

Choate, former Assistant Attorney General, Bozeman; George Y. Pat-
 ten, former judge supreme court, Bozeman; W. S. Davidson, banker;
 Bozeman; R. E. Bodley, county agent, Bozeman; Dr. W. C. Dawes, phy-
 sician, Bozeman; Walter S. Hartman, attorney, Bozeman; B. B. Law,
 district judge, Bozeman; H. G. Klemme, Bozeman; L. E. Hathaway,
 Bozeman; Frank O. Wilton, Bozeman; David C. Morris, Bozeman;
 H. J. Miller, former district judge, Livingston; George B. Winston, dis-
 trict judge, Anaconda; Charles R. Nevin, chairman State Democratic
 committee, Butte; A. F. Lamey, State governor, Rotary; R. G. Line-
 barger, president State Press Association, Havre; E. O. Hedrick, county
 treasurer, Lewistown; W. W. Blackford, attorney, Lewistown; R. E.
 McHugh, county attorney, Philipsburg; W. C. Husband, attorney, Har-
 lowton; Charles Gordon, attorney, Wolf Point; A. F. Ziebarth, farmer,
 Plentywood; Stanley E. Felt, district judge, Baker; John Hurley, dis-
 trict judge, Glasgow; Hans Walachi, attorney, Kalispell; Julius J.
 Wuertner, attorney, Great Falls; C. W. Pomeroy, district judge, Kali-
 spell; A. L. Stone, banker, Dillon; W. M. Johnston, Billings; H. Leonard
 DeKalb, attorney, Lewistown; G. S. Schmidt, attorney, Fort Benton;
 T. H. Pridham, attorney, Choteau; A. H. Stafford, secretary of agricul-
 ture, Helena; Pearl Smith, attorney, Dillon; E. A. Peterson, attorney,
 Bozeman; E. H. Goodman, Townsend; John B. Muzzy, attorney, Stan-
 ford; Henry G. Rodgers, attorney, Dillon; J. B. Knight, county attor-
 ney, Anaconda; T. J. Davis, Butte; Leo Graybill, Great Falls;
 Frank W. Haskins, attorney, Butte; H. V. Beeman, attorney, Forsyth;
 O. W. Belden, banker and former speaker of house, Lewistown; O. F.
 Goddard, district judge, Billings; V. C. Miller, attorney, Livingston;
 Frank Linderman, editor, Kalispell; G. M. Moss, editor, Whitefish;
 A. H. Bowman, former secretary agriculture, Hardin; Leon Shaw, editor
 Billings Gazette, Billings; Henry L. Myers, former judge supreme court,
 Billings; Ed. Davies, State coal-mine inspector; W. J. Jamison, jr.,
 attorney, Billings; J. J. O'Shea, secretary National Farmers' Union,
 Roberts; J. T. Kelly, president Montana Farmers' Union, Castagne;
 James Griffin, senator, Chinook; R. C. Battey, district manager Interna-
 tional Harvester, Billings; G. W. Farr, attorney, Miles City; J. R.
 Scanlon, editor Miles City Star; Charles L. Tyman, attorney, White
 Sulphur Springs; C. E. Collette, attorney, Sidney; Hon. SCOTT LEAVITT,
 Congressman, Great Falls; H. B. Mitchell, former mayor, Great Falls;
 J. L. Dobell, Butte; William Daly, Butte; Earle Genzberger, Butte; Curtis
 L. Wilson, Butte; J. R. Thomas, Butte; W. T. Scott, school of mines,
 Butte; Rabbi Emanuel Sternheim, Butte; Malcom Gillis, Butte; P. J.
 Anderson, farmer, Conrad; B. J. Anderson, farmer, Fairview; George E.
 Ericson, attorney, Bagley; L. J. Onstad, attorney, Plentywood; Howard
 M. Lewis, attorney, Plentywood; Walter Aitken, president Montana Bar
 Association, Bozeman; Charles W. Gardiner, trade unionist, Butte; Ike E.
 O. Pace, attorney, Whitehall; Walter D. Kemmism, State senator, Sid-
 ney; D. G. Stivers, attorney, Butte; H. L. Wolfe, attorney, Malta;
 William H. Bartley, attorney, Miles City; Andrew Ueland, banker,
 Outlook.

STATE LEGISLATURE

W. K. Adams, Sidney; Robert Brownley, Big Timber; William H.
 Buttleman, Willow Creek; G. H. Corrington, Ryegate; Ray Church,
 Helena; C. C. Conser, Plevna; George Cooper, Haugen; William T.
 Cowan, Box Elder; C. W. Demel, Billings; M. M. Duncan, Virginia City;
 J. D. Garber, Plains; C. F. Delwo, Valier; John A. Green, Vida; James
 Griffin, Chinook; Frank Hazelbaker, Dillon; W. C. Henderson, Miles
 City; J. H. Leuthold, Molt; C. A. Linn, White Sulphur Springs; F. T.
 McCormick, Roundup; J. L. Mears, Geyser; John Oliver, Ekalaka;
 H. E. Pomeroy, Eureka; S. H. Porter, Big Sandy; H. M. Shelper, Liv-
 ington; J. C. Smith, Miles City; J. W. Speer, Great Falls; J. T.
 Spencer, Bridger; Burton Watson, Missoula; W. L. Staggs, Wibaux;
 John Survant, Malta; George R. Swift, Hysham; R. R. Tower, Polson;
 A. S. Aynsworth, Thompson Falls; Charles A. Akofer, Valier; P. J.
 Anderson, Twete; T. R. Bergstrom, Willard; N. J. Brandt, Whitewater;
 Albert Budas, Roberts; Henry L. Burno, Harlem; John L. Campbell,
 Missoula; William Castles, Superior; W. E. Clarke, Forsyth; William
 Cusick, Kalispell; Glen T. Davis, Helena; H. C. Donaldson, Fort Benton;
 Ted Doran, Butte; Houghton A. Duncan, Great Falls; Ernest Eaton,
 Billings; Mark Fitzgerald, Stevensville; W. P. Flynn, Miles City; Fred
 E. Gordon, Hardin; F. L. Greybill, Great Falls; H. W. Greene, Lindsey;
 Orville Harris, White Sulphur Springs; Hugh C. Hawley, Harlem; E. O.
 Hedrick, Lewistown; J. O. Higham, Belfry; Joe Hoffman, Reed Point;
 C. F. Holt, Great Falls; Albert Holton, Cohagen; E. N. Joffre, Clancy;
 Albert Johnson, Denton; Elmer Johnson, Glasgow; J. D. Kennedy,
 Philipsburg; H. E. Larson, Plentywood; Robert Leavens, Billings; C. A.
 Lemon, Anaconda; T. E. Lincoln, Kalispell; Lester Loble, Helena;
 H. S. Masters, Livingston; T. A. Meagher, Choteau; Timothy Miller,
 Libby; J. J. Moriarity, Circle; D. C. Morris, Fort Benton; G. M. Moss,
 Whitefish; W. A. Ruffeorn, Opheim; Harry Schoening, Wolf Point;
 W. T. Wait, Broadus; Noble M. Walker, Lewistown; Ole M. Wold,
 Laurel; Julius Wuertner, Great Falls; Fred W. Zehn, Missoula; Ralph
 Bricker, speaker of house, Windham.

A recent poll of the Butte Rotary at one of their luncheons gave 46
 ayes, 6 noes.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consid-
 eration of the bill (S. 51) to subject certain immigrants,

born in countries of the Western Hemisphere, to the quota under
 the immigration laws.

Mr. BINGHAM obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable
 me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut
 yield for that purpose?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators an-
 swered to their names:

Allen	George	Kean	Steck
Ashurst	Gillett	Kendrick	Steinwer
Baird	Glass	McKellar	Stephens
Bingham	Glenn	McNary	Sullivan
Black	Goff	Norbeck	Swanson
Blaine	Gould	Norris	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Greene	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Hale	Overman	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Phipps	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Pittman	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Ransdell	Wagner
Connally	Hawes	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Hayden	Robson, Ky.	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Hebert	Sheppard	Watson
Dale	Heflin	Shipstead	Wheeler
Dill	Howell	Shortridge	
Fess	Johnson	Simmons	
Frazier	Jones	Smoot	

Mr. FESS. My colleague the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr.
 McCulloch] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I ask
 that this announcement may stand for the day.

I wish to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr.
 Oddie] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Walcott] are
 absent on official business.

Mr. BLAINE. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr.
 La Follette] is unavoidably absent. I ask that this announce-
 ment may stand for the day.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to announce that my colleague the
 junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Schall] is unavoidably
 absent. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from
 Florida [Mr. Fletcher], the Senator from Utah [Mr. King],
 and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Smith] are all
 detained from the Senate by illness.

I also wish to announce that the junior Senator from Tennes-
 see [Mr. Brock] and the junior Senator from South Carolina
 [Mr. Blease] are absent because of illness in their families.

I further desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas
 [Mr. Robinson] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Reed]
 are in London attending the naval conference.

Mr. NORBECK. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr.
 McMaster] is unavoidably absent from the city. I ask that
 this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered
 to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, on yesterday I gave some
 figures in regard to the volume of our exports to South America.
 One of the Senators who comes from a State which manufac-
 tures a large proportion of the articles exported to South
 America has told me that there is considerable unemployment
 in his State. It has occurred to me that he might be inter-
 ested to know that in 1929, we sold to Latin America auto-
 mobiles, motor trucks, busses, and passenger cars to the value
 of \$99,471,000. In other words, Latin America buys from us at
 the present time about \$100,000,000 worth of automobiles each
 year. It is well known that European countries are engaged in
 producing automobiles, which they think are just as good as
 ours, and are trying to compete with us in price. I should like,
 Mr. President, to call the attention of the Senator to whom I
 have referred and others in whose States automobiles are manu-
 factured, and who are looking to the Latin-American market to
 dispose of them, to the fact that if we shall pass the bill now
 before us, America is likely to become far more unpopular than
 she is to-day. There is likely to be placed on the purchaser of
 an American automobile in those countries a certain odium
 which attaches to those who purchase goods from a country
 which is extremely unpopular. It is my profound belief, Mr.
 President, that the passage of the proposed legislation is likely
 to lead to more unemployment in this country rather than to
 increase the chances of employment by keeping out immigrants
 from the countries to the south of us.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that
 point?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut
 yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. Was the Senator so considerate of the attitude of foreign countries when he was voting for high tariff rates?

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator was absent yesterday when I stated that in an editorial from a leading newspaper published in Latin America, *La Prensa*, a newspaper which has in Latin America an influence similar to that of the *London Times* in England, it was pointed out that the people of Argentina would prefer rather to have shut off several million dollars' worth of their trade with the United States on account of the tariff than to have their immigration into this country limited to 375 a year, which is the total number of persons who came in from Argentina in 1928 for the purposes of study, travel, and as merchants. In other words, the newspaper *La Prensa* pointed out the fact that the injury to their pride, the injury to their feelings, the injury to their honor and their self-respect was in their minds a far graver matter than the tariff, and that they would prefer to go without several million dollars' worth of our trade rather than to be told by the United States that they were not wanted in this country any more than were immigrants from Europe, and that they were to receive no different treatment from that accorded to immigrants from the countries of Europe.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the Senator, as I recall, was in favor of the restriction of immigration from European countries, notwithstanding the fact they may have similar sensibilities.

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; but, as I pointed out yesterday at a time when the Senator was not present, we have for the last hundred years endeavored to build up what we have called Pan Americanism, a feeling of brotherhood with the South and Central American countries. We have endeavored for the sake of peace on the American continent, and for the sake of our commerce with those countries, to say to our friends down there that we did not regard them as being on the same basis as Europeans. We have endeavored to show them that, since they have copied our Constitution, since they have copied our institutions, since they are striving toward the same objects politically and governmentally that we are, we wish to put them on a different basis. When the immigration act was before Congress in 1924 the late Senator Willis, of Ohio, offered an amendment which he described in these words:

This amendment, in effect, simply provides that the same rule which is applied to the remainder of the world shall be applied to the American continent.

When that amendment was voted upon 33 Senators now sitting in the Senate voted against it: Messrs. BROOKHART, BROUSSARD, CAPPER, CARAWAY, DALE, DILL, FESS, FLETCHER, FRAZIER, HALE, HOWELL, JONES, KENDRICK, KEYES, KING, MCKELLAR, McNARY, NORRIS, ODDIE, OVERMAN, PHIPPS, PITTMAN, REED, ROBINSON of Arkansas, SHIPSTEAD, SHORTRIDGE, SIMMONS, SMOOT, STEPHENS, SWANSON, TRAMMELL, WALSH of Massachusetts, and WALSH of Montana.

In that debate the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess], who was one of those who argued against the amendment offered by his colleague, said:

I think we must accord a different treatment, a different code of treatment, to South and Central American countries and Canada from what we accord to Europe. Juxtaposition, geographically speaking, makes them different.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, may I inquire to what the roll call from which the Senator has just read related?

Mr. BINGHAM. The roll call related to an amendment offered by the late Senator Willis, of Ohio, to the immigration bill which, the Senator will remember, was being discussed in April, 1924, which amendment I did not read but described in Senator Willis's own language as an amendment, in effect, which "provides that the same rule which is applied to the remainder of the world shall be applied to the American Continent." The junior Senator from Virginia is not recorded as having voted at that time.

From the figures of visas issued by our consular officials during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, it appears that 4,556 persons applied for visas in their desire to come to the United States from the 18 South and Central American republics south of Mexico. The figures are rather interesting, Mr. President: Argentina, 375; Bolivia, 52; Brazil, 517; Chile, 230; Colombia, 548; Costa Rica, 163; Dominican Republic, 240; Ecuador, 129; Salvador, 188; Guatemala, 236; Haiti, 63; Honduras, 208; Nicaragua, 278; Panama, 355; Paraguay, 3; Peru, 305; Uruguay, 80; Venezuela, 586. In only three cases are there more than 500 from any one country, and in nearly all cases there are less than 300. I am informed by Doctor Rowe, the distinguished Director General of the Pan American Union, who is

more familiar with Latin America than is any other person in this country, that nearly all of those included in the above number who came to the United States belonged to classes known as students, visitors, travelers, and merchants, who came to this country for temporary residence. They could come to this country perfectly well under the bill offered by the Senator from Georgia and now before us for consideration. Practically none of them were laborers; practically none of them came to this country to seek employment now held or which could be held by Americans; practically none of them would be kept out by this bill.

In other words, Mr. President, the effect of the bill offered by the Senator from Georgia would not be to decrease the number of persons now coming to the United States from South America. It would permit them to come, because they would not come under the quota, being temporary visitors. And it would also permit about 2,000 laborers to come, or about 100 from each of the countries, and perhaps a few more from Brazil. But those laborers do not want to come. They never have come. There will be no effect whatsoever on these 18 countries except to produce hard feelings; except to produce the impression that we regard them as inferior to us and to our race; except to show them that, while we are perfectly willing that persons shall come in from Canada to any extent, we are unwilling that there may be permitted freely to come what few persons desire to come to the United States from the 18 South and Central American Republics that are now sending us practically no immigrants who compete with our laborers, with our wage-earning classes. The only effect will be to show them that, in our opinion, there is nothing in the ideal of so-called Pan Americanism; to show them that we are now willing to regard them on the same basis as the rest of the world, and that the statement of our public men, our Presidents and Secretaries of State for many years past really have all to be put in the discard to-day, and that we propose to regard our neighbors to the south, even though there is no logical reason for doing so, as on the same basis as are European countries.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Has the Senator given the figures as to number of immigrants who would be permitted to enter the United States from South and Central America under both the so-called Harris bill and the so-called Johnson bill, which is pending in the House?

Mr. BINGHAM. Under the Harris bill, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, the number from these 18 countries would be on the quota basis, or 2 per cent of the persons now in this country whose origin was in those countries. Due to the fact that we have never kept an accurate list of persons coming in from those countries, due to the fact that in our censuses we have never set forth that a given person was of Argentine origin or Brazilian origin or Chilean origin, but have only said "South American" or "Central American," as the case might be, it is impossible for our officials to state how many persons there are in this country from each one of those countries, and therefore the best that they could do would be to estimate the total number from those countries and to allow a 2 per cent quota, which would amount to about 2,000 persons.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is that what the Senator has just read?

Mr. BINGHAM. No; I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Did he indicate the number of possible immigrants from the various South and Central American countries?

Mr. BINGHAM. What I read was the number of persons entering the United States from these 18 Republics in 1929. The so-called Johnson bill now on the House Calendar, and which I believe some Senator is proposing to offer as an amendment to the bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia, takes those figures as a basis for a quota and states that wherever those figures are less than 100 that country shall have the minimum number, which is 100, and in other cases shall have the same number; so that the quota under the Johnson bill would amount to 4,758. The quota under the Harris bill would amount to about 2,000; but, as I pointed out, due to the fact that practically all persons now desiring to come in from these 18 countries are tourists or students or merchants not desiring permanent residence, it would not affect the situation at all. In other words, it would not relieve our labor market one-millionth of 1 per cent, but it would offend the people of 18 countries that are to-day among our very best customers; for, as I pointed out yesterday, we sell to the countries of Latin America nearly \$1,000,000,000 worth of goods a year.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, do the figures which the Senator has given include a quota to Mexico?

Mr. BINGHAM. They do not.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. They include all of the countries, other than Mexico, to the south?

Mr. BINGHAM. Other than Mexico, and other than Cuba.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Then the total net difference between the Harris bill and the Johnson bill is that the Johnson bill will possibly permit 2,000 more persons to emigrate to this country than the Harris bill permits?

Mr. BINGHAM. About 2,700 more.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator give us the figures as to Mexico with respect to these two bills?

Mr. BINGHAM. I stated at the beginning of my remarks yesterday—I think the Senator was not present—that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] would take up the Mexican situation and treat it at length. As he comes from the State of Arizona, which is contiguous to Mexico, and as he is much more familiar with the Mexican situation than I am, I have eliminated from my remarks all reference to Mexico.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I ask the Senator a further question? Does the so-called Johnson bill fix a quota for Canadians?

Mr. BINGHAM. It does. It fixes it at the amount of the number of visas of Canadians that came into this country a year or two ago.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So that the Johnson bill is different from the Harris bill in the fact that it does fix a quota upon immigration from Canada, with which the Harris bill does not deal?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct; but if the Senator desires to know the opinion of the leading South American people and of the leading newspaper in South America on the Johnson bill, he will find two editorials referring to the Johnson bill placed in the RECORD in my remarks of yesterday.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator. Will the Senator permit me to have read at the desk, at the conclusion of his speech, an editorial from a Boston paper in opposition to a quota being based upon immigration from Canada?

Mr. BINGHAM. I shall be very glad to have that done.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that at the close of the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut an editorial from the Boston Post of yesterday be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOWELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the able Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On the abstract question of South and Central American sensibilities—which I readily concede we must take into consideration—does not the Senator think that we shall remove all just cause for criticism if we establish more liberal quotas for the Western Hemisphere than we do for the Old World?

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no doubt that it would somewhat alleviate the feelings of our neighbors to the south if the proposal which has been made at various times that the quota from the American Republics be 10 per cent, instead of 2 per cent, were adopted. It would make them feel that we were not treating them exactly like the European nations. There is no doubt about that. That would be preferable to the bill now before us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Johnson bill at least in lesser degree undertakes to discriminate; does it not?

Mr. BINGHAM. It does. There is no question about the fact that the Johnson bill would remove a certain part of the sting, and is preferable to the Harris bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator would not take the position, then, that under no circumstances would we ever be entitled to apply any quotas to Western Hemisphere countries?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, as one who has spent a good part of his more active life in those countries, and as one who perhaps appreciates their point of view now far better than he did before, and knows their pride of race, their pride in their history, the fact that for many years they looked up to us as their model, they copied our Constitution, they copied our institutions—as one who remembers they have been told repeatedly by our public men, as I pointed out yesterday and as I shall put into the RECORD later to-day, that they are our neighbors, that we want them to regard us differently from Europe; that we do not want them to believe the people who have been constantly preaching anti-Americanism to them with the idea that we were not their friends—as one familiar with these facts, I should regret extremely to see anything done, until the need arises, which would say to these 18 Republics that send us no labor, that send us no immigrants except students and teachers and merchants and others who really do not come under the

quota, that send us practically no one to compete with our wage earners here: "Notwithstanding the fact that you do not compete with us, we propose to treat you on the same basis as Europe."

Mr. VANDENBERG. It does seem to me, if the Senator will permit me, that it would be most unfortunate to leave the abstract statement standing that we have failed to differentiate between the Old World and the New World. If in this measure which we are about to perfect we should grant more liberal quotas to the Western Hemisphere than we do to the Old World, it seems to me that that does distinctly acknowledge a larger measure of Western Hemisphere unity, and does satisfy these sensibilities to which the Senator refers in South and Central America.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no question about that, Mr. President. The Senator is quite right, provided that no distinction is made between the English-speaking countries to the north of us and the Latin-speaking countries to the south of us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That probably is true.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Senator recognize that there is a sore spot in our immigration problem so far as the Western Hemisphere is concerned?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes, Mr. President; but the arguments which I have heard—and I have read most of the hearings—relate almost entirely to the immigrants from one country, Mexico. There is no objection to any persons that have come to us from the other 18 Latin American countries.

Mr. JOHNSON. Now let me pursue that with the Senator, if he will permit me, for just a moment.

There is recognized a situation in regard to Mexico that ought, if it can be, to be remedied. The situation as regards the Latin American countries of the hemisphere, however, is a situation that is negligible in character in the numbers that come here and the reasons for their coming. The situation in regard to Canada I do not regard as comparable to that which exists in reference to Mexico. Is the Senator in accord with that?

Mr. BINGHAM. I agree with the Senator in that regard.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is troubling me in this matter is this: If there is a situation that we ought to remedy concerning Mexico I should like to touch it; but if it be offensive to touch Latin America otherwise, and there is no occasion at the present time to deal with it at all, and if the Canadian situation is one that does not require treatment at the moment, then why not deal with the one sore spot of Mexico in the legislation we are now seeking?

Mr. BINGHAM. May I say to the Senator that if he were able to persuade the Senate to do that he would then appeal to the logical minds of the people in the great countries to the south of us. They have repeatedly stated in editorials in their leading newspapers that they could see some reason for our dealing with a vast immigration from Mexico of a character not desired, because they themselves do not desire to have a certain class of immigrants come into their countries. What "riles" them, what feeds the appetite of the anti-American spirit down there, what leads to an intense feeling on the part of their logical minds is the fact that although there is only one country of the 19 that is sending to us what might perhaps be called undesirable immigrants, we propose to punish all the 19. We propose to "insult," as they say, the other 18.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the Senator will permit me a step further, without for an instant conceding that it is an "insult," or conceding that there is any right to protest, except, of course, in their own land to write such editorials as they desire, here is a situation presented, if the Senator is familiar with the Johnson bill—and I presume he is; I mean the bill introduced by Congressman JOHNSON of the House—

Mr. BINGHAM. I am familiar with it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Here is a situation presented wherein arbitrary, specific quotas are fixed for the Latin American countries that are inconsequential in character and in number. That is a fact that can not be gainsaid.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have given most of those figures this morning in reading the numbers of those that came to us in 1929.

Mr. JOHNSON. I realize that. So far as Canada is concerned, the bill that he presents makes a mere gesture by fixing the number of those who may be admitted at the number that has just come in. All right. Now, the one thing that is of consequence and of moment is the portion of the bill that deals with Mexico. We have a problem there, and a sore spot there. I would rather take this bill and deal, so far as I am concerned, with that problem and that sore spot, instead of making a gesture respecting Canadian immigration, and instead

of dealing with a wholly infinitesimal quantity in relation to the remainder of Latin America.

That was the thought that I desired to suggest to the Senator in interrupting him.

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope very much that what the Senator proposes may be done, because I am sure it would relieve a very large part of the animosity which is sure to arise in Latin America if this bill passes in its present form, or even in the form of the Johnson bill.

The Senator will remember that there appeared before his committee, when he was chairman of the Committee on Immigration, Secretary of State Kellogg, in March, 1928, who stated that his department had endeavored to find out, through our representatives throughout Latin America, how the various bills limiting immigration from the other countries in this hemisphere were regarded in Latin America. He became convinced that such a measure would adversely affect the present good relations of the United States with Latin America and Canada, and would be prejudicial to the very considerable American interests in the countries under discussion. He said:

The department has therefore considered it necessary to a proper discharge of its responsibilities in this connection to present this statement with regard to its findings as to the reaction to be expected if the legislation in question is enacted and as to the importance of the American interests which are involved.

An examination of the situation indicates that there is no immigration problem of importance with any American country with the possible exception of Mexico.

As the Senator from California has just pointed out.

He went further, and stated that the extension to these countries of quota restrictions on the basis of only 2 per cent of the persons born in the Latin American countries, and the resulting limitation of immigrants to 1,900 from all those 19 countries, exclusive of Mexico, would have a most unfortunate effect upon the efforts which the State Department has been making to encourage greater travel of citizens of the United States to Latin America and of Latin American citizens to the United States, and indirectly would have an adverse effect upon our efforts to bring about a larger exchange of students between the United States and the countries to the south of us.

He went on to say:

I want to say further that the greatest field for commercial enterprise to-day is in Central and South America, and I will show you the extent to which the United States is becoming interested there when later I read to you our investments in those countries.

I am not going to give the figures at the point where they are given in his statement, so I will merely say at the present time that the estimated American investments in South America at the time that Secretary Kellogg made this statement to the committee were \$2,115,000,000; in Central America, \$225,000,000.

Mr. Kellogg also said:

I mention those matters as showing that the amount of trade of the United States in Latin American countries, which is the largest, as you will find, of any country in the world—the solidarity between the United States and those countries, which was evidenced in the last conference, shows that as far as we are concerned it is of the utmost importance for us, not only on account of trade and commerce but on other accounts, to have the best feeling between ourselves and the Latin American countries.

I shall not read at this time, as my time is limited, but I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD quotations from Secretary Kellogg's testimony at this point, as well as quotations from leading citizens who are personally familiar with the situation in South America, and of some of our diplomatic representatives, all of which go to show that the effect of this legislation on Latin America would be disastrous, so far as their attitude toward us is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Extracts from statement of Hon. Frank B. Kellogg, ex-Secretary of State]

The State Department is convinced that such a measure would adversely affect the present good relations of the United States with Latin America and Canada and would be prejudicial to the very considerable American interests in the countries under discussion. The department has therefore considered it necessary to a proper discharge of its responsibilities in this connection to present this statement with regard to its findings as to the reaction to be expected if the legislation in question is enacted and as to the importance of the American interests which are involved.

An examination of the situation indicates that there is no immigration problem of importance with any American country with the possible exception of Mexico.

The extension of the quota system to those countries would be distinctly objectionable. The extension to those countries, however, of quota restrictions on the basis of only 2 per cent of the persons born in the Latin American countries and the resulting limitation of immigrants to 1,900 from all those 19 countries exclusive of Mexico would have a most unfortunate effect upon the efforts which the State Department has been making to encourage greater travel of citizens of the United States to Latin America and of Latin American citizens to the United States, and indirectly would have an adverse effect upon our efforts to bring about a larger exchange of students between the United States and the countries to the south of us. I want to say further that the greatest field for commercial enterprise to-day is in Central and South America, and I will show you the extent to which the United States is becoming interested there when later I read to you our investments in those countries.

I mention those matters as showing that the amount of trade of the United States in Latin American countries, which is the largest, as you will find, of any country in the world—the solidarity between the United States and those countries, which was evidenced in the last conference, shows that as far as we are concerned it is of the utmost importance for us, not only on account of trade and commerce but on other accounts, to have the best feeling between ourselves and the Latin American countries.

In July of last year the diplomatic missions of the United States in Central and South America were asked to submit reports based on their knowledge of official and public opinion in the countries to which they were accredited as to the probable effect upon relations of such countries with the United States of the enactment of legislation applying quota restrictions to immigrants from Latin America. The replies justify the statement that the imposition of numerical limitations on the Central and South American countries would be deeply resented by them.

The reports indicate that these countries feel that there should be the greatest freedom of travel and communication between the countries of this hemisphere, and that they are cognizant and appreciative of the privileged status they now enjoy under the immigration act of 1924. They are disposed to consider it in fact a manifestation of that high regard which this Government has for them, and a tangible evidence of the close association of the American countries. Under existing law in these countries, American citizens are now permitted to travel and settle in their territory quite freely. Moreover there is now a certain community of interest among the American countries having similar immigration problems and some indication of a tendency to follow similar policies.

The reports from American diplomatic representatives in these countries are practically unanimous in their statement that the application of quota restrictions to the countries of Central and South America could not fail to be interpreted by them as a radical departure from the traditional policy of this country toward Latin America and as evidence of unwillingness to continue to regard them as equals and neighbors having common problems, interests, and aims. They have given and are giving their fair share toward the development of the Western Hemisphere in cooperation with the United States. They have a sense of real pride in their achievements and in the qualities of their people. They are well aware of the fact that there is no danger of considerable immigration to the United States from anyone of them except Mexico—and the increase of immigration from that country is problematical.

The enactment of such legislation would be seized upon by certain elements within those countries and abroad which are unfriendly to the United States in general and to its policies on immigration in particular as an excuse to stir up feeling against this country, its citizens, and its interests. It is certain that the Latin American press would indulge in considerable hostile comment and thus materially assist those who wish to impair the good relations which now exist between the United States and Latin America. Action of the kind contemplated at this time could easily result in a campaign of anti-Americanism which would go far toward undoing all that has been accomplished toward effecting closer relations with other American countries during the past quarter of a century and make difficult further efforts in that direction. Not only would this be very regrettable from a point of view of international policy, but it would be apt to have an adverse effect upon the prosperity of American business interests in those countries.

The vice president of a mining company writes under date of February 15, 1928, saying:

"The attitude of the Chilean toward the United States has ranged from animosity to friendship. The American business interests in Chile

have used every endeavor to establish friendly relations between the two nations and with some success. The national feeling that would result from the restriction of immigration from Latin American countries would be a serious handicap to the continuance of such relations and make more difficult the negotiation of business problems that are continually arising between American business interests and the Chilean Government.

"In all Latin American countries public sentiment is very sensitive to anything which seems to reflect on their civilization. Whatever may be the economic reasons alleged for the proposed legislation it will be interpreted as an affront. National pride will be wounded and resentment engendered. This unquestionably will react on the business and political relations with the United States. * * * General business would be affected unfavorably, and there is the further possibility of hostile legislation toward the industrial companies with a view to hampering their employment of North Americans in their enterprises. The policy of the North American companies engaged in development enterprises in South America, and also of the commercial firms, is to employ natives wherever possible. It is, however, necessary to have a certain proportion of citizens of the United States in all these enterprises."

Here is a very important letter from our minister at Bogota, Colombia, who reports in speaking of our relations with Colombia [reading]: "Some country will provide the money, material, and skilled labor necessary to make this one of the most prosperous and attractive lands of South America. If we do not furnish it, it will come from Europe, and with it perhaps a large European immigration. * * *

"While from an economic point of view the extension of the quota law to South America is both unnecessary and undesirable, from a political and diplomatic standpoint it would, in my opinion, be a serious mistake and a great setback to our efforts for effecting more good will and better understanding between the United States and the countries to her south. Since no good reason can be advanced, as the Colombian views it, for extending that law to him, its application here would, I fear, lead him to conclude that we regard him as an inferior, as he is very proud of his race. He would undoubtedly resent the restrictions and show his resentment by placing many obstacles in the way of our citizens entering here for commercial and other business purposes. This would be another hindrance to our participating in the development of this country and a serious setback to our growing commerce here. * * * Such a law * * * would give added strength to the persistent efforts of Europeans to foster anti-Americanism for their own commercial ends. * * *

The report from the embassy at Habana contains the following statement with regard to the Cubans:

"The enactment of any such measure as that envisaged in the department's instruction under reference would certainly wound them deeply, and I can readily foresee a campaign of intense anti-Americanism if such a measure is passed. The vast American interests here would certainly suffer to a greater or lesser degree."

As to Ecuadorian appreciation of nonquota status the following is quoted:

"The fact that the quota restrictions of the immigration act of 1924 do not now apply to Ecuador I think is appreciated by Ecuadorians, who feel that they are being placed thereby in a privileged position, a conviction which tends to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the two countries. Moreover, the realization that they can, if they desire, enter the United States freely, undoubtedly tends to lessen that feeling of suspicion entertained by many Ecuadorians that the people of the United States regard themselves as occupying a superior position, from a political as well as a social point of view, as compared with the other countries of the American Continent."

The minister to Uruguay writes with regard to the proposed legislation to apply the quotas to Latin-American countries:

"It is my opinion that, in so far as Uruguay is concerned, it would be seized upon by the ever alert anti-American propagandists in this country and exploited as a deliberately unfriendly act toward Latin Americans."

A tangible disadvantage to be expected as a result of the ill feeling in the countries of Central and South America against this country occasioned by the imposition of quota restrictions on them would be in the matter of retaliatory measures restricting and limiting the entry of American citizens to their territory. Serious harm to the important American interests in these countries could not but result from such measures, and this Government, having taken the initiative, would not be in a position to make any representations nor could it hope to succeed in any endeavor to limit such restrictions to the scope of those imposed by this country.

In the first place, it is the opinion of the accredited representatives of the United States in the countries concerned as well as representative business men and others in a position to have first-hand knowledge of the situation that the measure contemplated would, if put into effect at this time, seriously injure the relations of the United States with the American countries and that it might even threaten Pan Americanism.

Needless to say this phase of the question is of great national importance as far as the foreign policy of the United States is concerned. In the second place, the economic situation of the country is involved since an important part of the foreign investments and trade of the United States are in those countries and would be vitally affected by any disturbance of the good relations now obtaining.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I want to ask the Senator whether he or any other Senator has in contemplation an amendment striking out the application of any quota provision as to countries other than Mexico?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not contemplate offering any amendment, but I gathered from what the Senator from California stated that he had that possibility in mind.

Mr. JOHNSON rose.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will say to the Senator from California that I inquired of the Senator from Connecticut whether he knew of any amendment in contemplation to strike out the quota provision with reference to any countries other than Mexico.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I say, with the permission of the Senator from Connecticut, that I have been seriously considering the matter in an endeavor to determine whether or not it could be worked out. The thought in my mind was to work out the situation in such fashion as to bring the least harm and cause the least difficulty, and deal alone with the Mexican situation, giving time for adjustment, if it were required, by those industries and those occupations which say at present that they require Mexican labor.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I inferred that from what the Senator stated.

Mr. JOHNSON. That has been in my mind, if it can be worked out.

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope very much the Senator can do that, because I believe it will have a very salutary effect on public opinion in South America.

Mr. President, the Senators who are doing me the honor to listen to these remarks have probably seen in the newspapers, during the past three or four years, repeated references to certain agitators in South America. Who pays their expenses, I do not know. There are two or three well-known agitators who have traveled from the Rio Grande to Patagonia and have even made speeches in Porto Rico and in the other islands of the Caribbean Sea. They have made impassioned speeches attempting to arouse the Latin-speaking peoples of those countries against the United States. They have painted us in the blackest colors. They have pictured us as tyrants, as imperialists, who sooner or later would gobble up their countries and put them under tutelage. They have referred to the taking of Porto Rico, to the taking of the Canal Zone, and they have exaggerated a great many things which have occurred, in an effort to build up a spirit of anti-Americanism.

At times their efforts have been successful in making a real difference in those countries. During the European war the two Temperate Zone countries in South America—Argentina and Chile—having the best navies and the best armies in South America, refused to follow us, as did Cuba and Panama and other countries, in joining with the Allies in that war. In fact, it was stated at that time that they gave comfort to our enemies. There was certainly an enormous amount of anti-American feeling apparent in both Argentina and Chile at that time.

Our public men have repeatedly made efforts to overcome that. The present President of the United States did a very unusual thing in taking a part of the time between his election and his inauguration for a trip through all those countries. He was met everywhere with the greatest cordiality. The significance of his trip was appreciated. He was met by the Presidents of those countries. The expressions of opinion which he received and which appeared in the newspapers down there showed that his trip had accomplished a great deal of good in cementing good relations, which lead not only to greater commerce but to a greater influence on the part of the United States in promoting peace.

I have been told on the highest authority that the passage of this bill in its present form would do away entirely with all the good which the President's trip accomplished. Not only that, but it would lead to embarrassment on the part of many Americans now living in those countries, who are subject to their laws, and who could be kept out of employment very easily by a slight change in the laws regarding the employment of engineers and other technical persons, frequently Americans, now employed very advantageously to us in those countries.

It seems to me it would be most unfortunate, the blackest blow which Pan Americanism had ever received, if this measure were passed. There is no doubt that immediately upon its passage the anti-American agitators would say, "There you go. There you see that what we have been saying is correct. The great country to the north of you has no real friendship for you. Although they have tried to prove that what we have said in the past was not correct, this very act of theirs shows we were correct, that they have no real friendship for you, that they do not regard you as real brothers. Although there are practically none of you going into the United States as immigrants, as laborers, they propose to put you on the same quota basis with countries which are ready to send hundreds of thousands of immigrants, who are ready to compete with their labor supply."

In addition to the commercial aspect of this situation, there is an aspect of promoting peace in the Western Hemisphere. Senators will realize that several times during the last 50 years we have been called upon to act as arbiters in boundary disputes. In the boundary dispute between Argentina and Chile President Cleveland was asked to act as the arbiter. In the great boundary dispute, which has lasted for so many years, over the question of Tacna and Arica, between Peru and Chile, President Coolidge was asked to arbitrate, and he appointed General Pershing to go down there and see what could be done in settling that very difficult situation. Thanks to the friendship of both Peru and Chile, and their admiration for the United States, it has been possible to work out that dispute, which had been unsettled for nearly 60 years, and that dispute now is in process of peaceful settlement.

At this very moment there are sitting in the city of Washington representatives of the countries of Paraguay and Bolivia who are engaged in an effort, under our friendly supervision, to try to settle their disputes without recourse to war.

I might multiply instances, but it is not necessary. We all know that the efforts of the United States, particularly in Central America and among some of the South American Republics, have been toward the promotion of peace, chiefly because we have shown a friendly spirit to them.

Mr. President, there is no question whatever in the minds of our diplomatic representatives, there is no question whatever in the opinion of the administration and of the State Department, there is no question whatever in the minds of those who have had commercial and personal and intellectual relations with South America, that the passage of this measure would result in a spirit of unfriendliness being promoted throughout South America to an extent which would interfere with our being selected or accepted as an arbiter in these disputes.

I shall ask that there be placed in the RECORD at this point a number of quotations from President Roosevelt, President Wilson, and Secretary of State Hughes, in regard to the attitude of this country toward Pan Americanism, which have given the countries to the south of us reason to believe that in the past we really desired to be their friends and brothers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[President Roosevelt, on the occasion of the laying of the corner stone of the Bureau of American Republics]

This is a memorable occasion for all the peoples of the Western Hemisphere. The building, the corner stone of which we lay to-day, emphasizes by its existence the growing sense of solidarity of interest and aspiration among all the peoples of the New World. It marks our recognition of the need to knit ever closer together all the Republics of the Western Hemisphere, through the kindly bonds of mutual justice, good will, and sympathetic comprehension.

In the next place, as President of this Republic, I greet the representatives of all our sister Republics to the south of us. In a sense, you are our elder sisters and we the younger people, for you represent a more ancient civilization on this continent than we do. Your fathers, the Spanish and Portuguese explorers, conquerors, lawgivers, and commonwealth-builders, had founded a flourishing civilization in the Tropics and the South Temperate Zone while all America north of the Rio Grande was still unmapped wilderness. Your people had founded American universities, were building beautiful cities, were laying deep the foundations of future national life at many different points in the vast territory stretching from the Colorado to the Plata before the ships of the Frenchman and the Englishman, the Swede and the Hollander, had found permanent havens on the North Atlantic seacoast. For centuries our several civilizations grew, each in its own way, but each sundered from the others. Now we are growing together.

His voyage [Secretary of State Elihu Root] was unique in character and in value. It was undertaken only because we citizens of this Republic recognize that our interests are more closely in-

tertwined with the interests of the other peoples of this continent than with those of any other nations. I believe that history will say that though we have had other great Secretaries of State, we have had none greater than Elihu Root; and that though in his office he had done much for the good of his Nation and of mankind, yet that his greatest achievement has been the success which has come as the result of his devoted labor to bring closer together all the Republics of the New World, and to unite them in the effort to work valiantly for our common betterment, for the material and moral welfare of all who dwell in the Western Hemisphere.

[Message of President Wilson to Pan American conference, January 19, 1920]

The great privileges that have been showered upon us, both by reason of our geographical position and because of the high political and social ideals that have determined the national development of every country of the American Continent, carry with them obligations, the fulfillment of which must be regarded as a real privilege of every true American. It is no small achievement that the Americas are to-day able to say to the world, "Here is an important section of the globe which has to-day eliminated the idea of conquest from its national thought and from its international policy." The spirit of mutual helpfulness which animates this conference supplements and strengthens this important achievement of international policy. I rejoice with you that we are privileged to assemble with the sole purpose of ascertaining how we can serve one another, for in so doing we best serve the world.

[Address of President Wilson before Second Pan American Scientific Congress, January 6, 1916]

The drawing together of the Americas, ladies and gentlemen, has long been dreamed of and desired. It is a matter of peculiar gratification, therefore, to see this great thing happen; to see the Americas drawing together, and not drawing together upon any insubstantial foundation of mere sentiment.

After all, even friendship must be based upon a perception of common sympathies, of common interests, of common ideals, and of common purposes.

Men can not be friends unless they intend the same things, and the Americas have more and more realized that in all essential particulars they intend the same thing with regard to their thought and their life and their activities.

[Charles E. Hughes's radio address January 20, 1925]

This Pan American cooperation rests upon the conviction that there are primary and mutual interests which are peculiar to the Republics of this hemisphere, and that these can best be conserved by taking counsel together and by devising appropriate means of collaboration. This implies no antagonism to any other people or part of the world, no menace to the prosperity of others, but in itself constitutes a most important contribution to world peace. Some of our people may think of Pan American endeavor as of especial concern to the interests of the Latin American Republics rather than to our own. But this is a serious mistake. We have the inescapable relations created by propinquity. We have the privileges and obligations of neighborhood; our activities are destined to be more and more interlaced; resistless economic forces draw us together. What could be more shortsighted than to ignore our mutual interests?

[From Our Relations to the Nations of the Western Hemisphere, by Charles E. Hughes]

There can be no doubt that there are Pan American interests and that there is a Pan American sentiment which demands the special cooperation of the American States. Those who deride it find fault with the small measure of achievement. Unless they are able to see solidarity effected by political union, they are disposed to minimize the advantages of such cooperation as is possible.

Mr. BINGHAM. In such phrases, in the recent decades, has Pan Americanism been preached by our leading statesmen.

Mr. President, all these quotations have given expression to the belief that these neighbors of ours were not to be regarded in the same light as our friends across the water in Europe, that we were desirous of treating them differently.

It has been extremely difficult for our Secretaries of State and our Presidents to overcome the natural sympathy of the Spanish-speaking countries for Spain and France, the natural sympathy against English-speaking countries. They have worked for years. Our statesmen, like Root and Hughes and Bacon, and our present President, by visits to those countries, have endeavored to sow the seeds of friendship in the Western Hemisphere. The seeds have sprouted and are bearing fruit. Our trade with South America at the present time is larger than that of any other country.

American goods are regarded as desirable, American intervention in times of trouble is regarded as desirable, because the leaders in those countries believe we have an unusual friend-

ship for them and a desire to establish friendly relations with all the countries of the Western Hemisphere. But the passage of this measure would strike the death blow to such hopes, for it would give to our enemies in those countries—and those countries are full of enemies of the United States—a real, practical argument to show that we of the United States no longer regard them as friends and brothers.

Mr. President, we know that that is not so. We know that there is just as friendly regard for South America and the South and Central American countries in the United States as there always has been. We know that the trouble is that there have been too many immigrants representing cheap labor coming in from Mexico, and they have competed in some of the States with American labor. We know that there is no sentiment against the immigrants from the other 18 countries. We know that in the United States we have just as friendly feeling toward them as we have always had and just as much respect for their people and for their institutions and their glorious history.

Friends of Latin America throughout the United States have long respected the lives of Bolivar, and of San Martin, who helped in the liberation of Argentina, Chile, and Peru; and the great Chilean patriot, O'Higgins; and the Colombian patriot, Santander; and the Ecuadorian patriot, Sucre, whose centenary is soon to be celebrated. We have respected their struggles for independence. We have respected their history. We have admired their institutions and we still do so. We admire their courage, their courtesy, their splendid heritage.

I desire to appeal to those within the sound of my voice, who have not already committed themselves in this regard, not to vote for a measure which in effect will say to 18 of those countries: "Although you have never sent us any immigrants to compete with our labor, we no longer desire to give you a favored status, but wish to regard you on the same basis as the nations across the Atlantic Ocean, and no longer as nations under the aegis of Pan Americanism, citizens of our sister Republics to the south."

I hope some way may be found, as suggested by the Senator from California or the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from Massachusetts, to avoid this serious blow to our friendly relations with these countries, to that fraternal spirit which we have endeavored for the past century to build up. I hope some way may be found which will satisfy those of us who desire to protect American labor, to protect American blood in this country, without offering anything which may be regarded in the 18 Republics to the south of Mexico as an affront to their civilization or to the spirit and history of their people. We still have the kindest feelings for them. We still believe in Pan Americanism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOWELL in the chair). The clerk will read the editorial sent to the desk by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

[From the Boston Post, April 10, 1930]

A CANADIAN QUOTA?

With all due respect to Henry E. Hull, Commissioner General of Immigration, who is a very conscientious and efficient public official, we do not see that he makes out a good case when he says that there should be a quota on Canadians coming into this country to live; or that there should be any system of "selective immigration," either, for that matter.

No one doubts that, as the commissioner says, the United States should have and has the right to restrict the number of immigrants that comes in here; that it has the right to put up the bars against Canada or any and all countries that it chooses. Any nation has the right to judge of the amount or the fitness of immigration just as it pleases. But there are sometimes cases where the right of a government is not the whole test of the fitness of its action. We believe that is the case with this attempt to limit the Canadians who come to the United States by means of a quota or any other restrictive measures.

Our Canadian citizens are among the best we have. They have the same language—or, in the case of French-Canadians, soon acquire it. They are united to us by similarities of government, of judicial methods, and by a hundred kindred ideas and customs. Will it, in the long run, pay to antagonize them, as it surely would to bar their free entrance into the country?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I desire to add that the editorial just read represents my sentiments in the matter of our immigration quota from Canada.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I had intended to reply to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM]. Does the Senator from Washington want to proceed at this time with the appropriation bill of which he has charge?

Mr. JONES. Yes. I do not think it will take very long.

Mr. HEFLIN. All right.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY OWEN D. YOUNG

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Owen D. Young at the University of Southern California as contained in the New York Times of March 25, 1930.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times March 25, 1930]

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the University of California, if one were to speak on international affairs, it would be fitting to do so at one or the other of those great ports which are our most sensitive contacts with the outside world. Through New York and San Francisco, inward and outward, flow in substantial part the great movement of men and things which constitute international transportation; of voices and records which make up international communication; of finance, that essential mechanism through which all these interchanges are made possible.

It is true that Washington, as the political focus of the Nation, makes our political contacts abroad, but they are relatively superficial and inconsequential compared with these sensitive forces of quick and constant action which represent our participation in the economic activities of the world. So, after the completion of the Dawes plan, I spoke of my experiences abroad, first in New York. Now, after the completion of the new plan, I consider it a privilege to say my first word at the great port of entry of the West. It is perhaps not inappropriate that it be said as a part of the celebration of this significant anniversary in the life of the University of California.

On the 11th day of November, 1918, the military forces engaged in the Great War suspended operations. For more than four years they had been our masters. They commanded our thoughts and our ambitions; they held as hostages our property and our lives; Politics had retired to second place; Economics had temporarily been forgotten.

POLITICS COMES TO THE FORE

After the military had suspended its act in the tragic drama, Politics and Economics again came on the stage. Politics, as she advanced to the footlights, had never seemed so charming. She received the applause of all the world. How delightful it was to get rid of that old witch of war who destroyed our wealth and our peace of mind, who murdered our sons, and who disarranged all the notions of our daughters! Is it any wonder that Politics commanded our admiration?

What high hopes we had of her! True, there was on the stage also a very modest being, ragged in clothing, bewildered in her senses, known as Economics. No one paid much attention to her in comparison with their lovely idol. Truly, Politics was mistress of the world. And with that setting, the play went on.

Politics, conscious of her power and with impatient hand, wrote a treaty while all the world was lost in admiration of her daring. In those days a part of her charm lay in her many moods. One day she spoke through Woodrow Wilson, and the audience sat breathless, moved by the high idealism of a great man and the rich expression of a master. Another day, by contrast, she was hard and cynical, and what the world calls practical, as she spoke through Clemenceau. And still another time she had the delightful abandon and irresponsibility of a mischievous mistress as she was impersonated by Lord George. And she had courage, too, because she swept away age-old boundaries and made new ones.

True, occasionally was heard the weak voice of Economics modestly protesting here and there, occasionally even offering advice, only to be silenced by the imperious gesture of the leading lady. And one day she decided what Germany was to pay by way of reparations, the sum of 132,000,000,000 marks, or one-quarter as many dollars. Then it was indeed time for Economics to speak, and she did, in protest. But she was quickly silenced by the great party in the palace of Versailles, the scene of so many grand affairs. Had not Politics always been mistress of Versailles? Had not Economics adways been a scullery maid? Why break the precedent now? Why listen to her in these great councils—and they didn't. And then—

"The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart."

TAKES ECONOMICS ON TOUR

Permit me to carry the figure one step farther. Politics now goes on tour, always taking her bedraggled associate with her, because even Politics knows that Economics must do the work. Politics in France says, and properly and sympathetically so:

"Your houses and lands have been destroyed, rebuild them, and do it handsomely—others will pay the costs." That was the program which Politics could start but which Politics could not stop. So the building went extravagantly on, and a few years later, when Germany failed to pay the cost and consequently there overhung France this addition to her vast interior debt, Politics said:

"We will make Germany pay. We will move our armies into the Ruhr and compel by force the production of coal and manufactured goods for reparation account."

But it turned out that the sword was a poor instrument with which to get economic results. Politics could put a French army in the Ruhr, but Politics could not take it out.

Politics in England said "If there be people out of work, or even people who do not want to work, give them a dole from the public treasury."

How generous she was. But there was a program which Politics could start but which Politics could not stop.

Politics in Germany said to Economics: "You seem depressed this morning with the great work you have to do. Let me give you a cocktail. I do not intend to get you intoxicated. Take a little stimulant, and after you are started, we will cut it out."

So Politics gave to Economics inflation. That was something which Politics could start but which Politics could not stop. As a result the currency of Germany was destroyed and her people were plunged into the depths of want and despair. Yes; it is easy for Politics, with her appeal to the emotions and her ingratiating manner, to start things in the field of economics which she can not stop.

ECONOMICS GETS A HEARING

And so it happened in the autumn of 1923. Then for the first time Economics got a hearing. The world began to doubt whether Politics, with all her charm, was safe and sound. Losing the applause of her audience, and with that something of her confidence, wringing her hands in despair, Politics finally called to Economics and said, "If I give you the opportunity, will you try to save the show?"

The Dawes committee convened in Paris on the 14th day of January, 1924. Its task was to provide a plan for the balancing of the German budget and for the stabilization of the German currency. It was not permitted to revise the amount of 132,000,000,000 marks which Politics had fixed for Germany to pay. So the Dawes committee did the very simple thing of fixing the annual installments which Germany should pay on account of reparations. These being fixed, the budget could be balanced and the currency stabilized. The Dawes committee did not specify the number of years which the installments were to run. No one ever computed the years, because it was apparent to the world from the size of the installments that the earlier reparation figures had been in fact if not in law abandoned.

The Dawes committee brought out its plan on the 9th day of April, 1924. It was made effective on August 16, 1924, at the conference of London by a treaty signed by the nations which were the beneficiaries of German reparations. By it a new central bank was established for Germany and a new currency was created with an adequate gold supply.

And to give you an idea of the results of the inflationary intoxication let me say that one mark of the new currency was exchangeable for a billion marks of the old currency, and I mean the continental billion, not ours; that is to say, a million million old marks for one new mark.

WORLD LEARNS FIRST BIG LESSON

And so Economics took the stage in Germany on the 1st day of September, 1924. A few days later the French armies began to move out of the Ruhr back home. The Germans began to work their mines and factories. The world learned its first great lesson—that economics does not function under political threats or military coercion. It performs obligations which are reasonably fair. It recognizes in the long run only self-interest and honor.

In a word, the world learned that coal and steel for reparations would come at the point of a pen on a check book, and would not come at the point of the bayonet in the hands of the soldier. Certainly it was demonstrated that in this field the pen is mightier than the sword.

You all know the story of Germany's economic recovery under the Dawes plan. She paid to her creditors during those five years the full amount set out in the plan, namely, 7,600,000,000 marks, which is the equivalent of \$1,917,000,000. Nevertheless the Dawes plan was a receivership plan for Germany. It was not a plan of permanent reorganization. Under it S. Parker Gilbert, a brilliant young American, was the receiver, and let me take this opportunity of saying that the success of the Dawes plan was largely made possible by his wise and efficient administration of the receivership. May I step aside long enough to call the attention of the students of California to the fact that Parker Gilbert was made agent general for reparations payments at the age of 32? He was graduated from Rutgers College in the class of 1912 and from the Harvard law school in the class of 1915. I speak of it here only because I want you to know that great opportunities and great responsibilities lie before you, not somewhere in the distant future, but almost here and now.

As I have said, the Dawes plan was an interval receivership plan—it did not even fix the total amount of the debt, although all the world knew that the original sum fixed by politics was quite impossible. Then, too, one could not expect a great nation of 60,000,000 people to function permanently in the hands of a receiver, and so at Geneva on October 20, 1928, Economics was again called by Politics, in the form of an experts committee, to make proposals for a complete and final settlement of the reparation problem. That committee met on February 11,

1929, in Paris, and on June 7 signed and transmitted its report of final settlement. That report is popularly known as the Young plan.

SPIRIT IN WHICH PLAN WAS MADE

May I say in passing that this habit of adopting the name of the chairman as the name of the committee began when the first experts committee was christened the Dawes committee. General Dawes was not keen about that change of name, but he said, you will remember, that somebody had to take the garbage and the garlands. It was in that same spirit that the Young committee and the Young plan were so named—and you may be sure that the chairman will receive more than his fair share of social prestige at the front door and a proportionate amount from the can at the back door, depending wholly on whether the affair is an afternoon tea or the "morning after" clean-up.

By the Young plan, the annual installment of the Dawes plan of 2,500,000,000 reichsmarks, plus a variable resulting from an index of prosperity, was reduced to an average for the first 37 years of 2,050,600,000 gold marks, that is to say, a reduction of 20 per cent or more. The annuities begin at 1,707,900,000 marks and advance slowly toward a maximum of 2,428,800,000 marks. After the first 37 years, the German installments gradually diminish from approximately 1,600,000,000 gold marks in 1966 to 897,800,000 in 1988.

Under the plan, the receivership of Germany is withdrawn. The mortgage of \$2,500,000,000 on the German railway system, created by the Dawes plan, is discharged. The general mortgage on German industry of over \$1,000,000,000 is also lifted. Germany is given a specific task to perform. Foreign armies provided by the political treaty are withdrawn. The Reparations Commission is wound up.

GERMAN HONOR ALONE AT STAKE

Care was taken in the plan to avoid the term "reparations." And so at last, 10 years after the armistice, under the new plan as drawn in Paris, Germany is free. She has a debt to pay, but that is all. Her honor, not her freedom, is at stake.

May I say a word about the problems and difficulties in Paris? I have told you that the Dawes payments were reduced something like 20 per cent and the total number of years which Germany should pay was also fixed. These installments, computed at their present value, represented a charge on Germany of something like \$9,000,000,000, or 36,000,000,000 marks. Politics, you will remember, fixed Germany's obligations at 132,000,000,000 marks, or \$33,000,000,000. In a word, our kitchen-maid, Economics, was compelled to cut the menu of her leading lady by more than 70 per cent to make it fit the prospects of the larder.

POLITICS REAPPEARS AT HAGUE

At The Hague Politics again appeared, and while protesting that she did not wish to put larger burdens on Germany, did increase somewhat—sufficiently for political purposes, I dare say—the burdens of the Paris plan; and most of those burdens do, in fact, ultimately fall on Germany. Then, too, at the Second Hague Conference, Politics again made an effort to substitute military sanctions for Germany's nonperformance, and in a most attenuated form such sanctions were provided.

Economics does not like military sanctions. Doctor Schacht protested, and has recently resigned the presidency of the Reichsbank because he was unwilling to assume responsibility for the execution of a plan which carried burdens additional to those imposed at Paris, and which had any color of military sanctions. Doctor Schacht has been accused in taking this action of having domestic political ambitions. It is fair to him to say that his protest arose, not because there was politics in Doctor Schacht, but because politics had again crept into the plan.

However, I have no fear of the slight political tinge which the plan took on at The Hague. Certainly this settlement was better than none. It would have been a great catastrophe for Germany and all the world had the plan agreed upon at Paris by the representatives of all the countries, including Germany, fallen in the hands of politics at The Hague. We are all to be congratulated that it did not do so, and perhaps, most of all, the Government of the United States.

AMERICA TO GET MORE THAN 60 PER CENT

I speak of my own country, because more than 60 per cent of the total sum to be paid by Germany must find its way to the United States in payment to us of the so-called international debts. You see that was one of our serious problems at Paris. Roughly, one-half of the Dawes payments were needed by the creditors of Germany to pay their debts to the United States. That obligation was fixed. So the entire reduction by the creditor countries in the Dawes payments, so far as their respective budgets were concerned, had to be made out of one-half of the payments; that is, every 5 per cent reduction to Germany in the Dawes plan payments meant a 10 per cent reduction in the net budget benefits of the creditor countries.

Now, a 20 per cent reduction in the Dawes plan payments looked small to Germany, but a resulting 40 per cent reduction in net budget benefits to the creditor countries looked very large to them. That was one serious problem at Paris.

Another was that the Dawes plan payments were distributed under what was known as the Spa percentages. Now, as the reduction in the German payments took place, some of the countries, notably Italy, under those percentages, would not have received enough to pay their indebtedness to the United States, while others would have a considerable surplus. Therefore, in order to secure a settlement at all, it was necessary at Paris to remake these percentages.

We not only had to set the total amount which Germany should pay but we had to redistribute that diminished amount among the creditor countries so that all would be satisfied. The problem of fixing Germany's total amount was not as difficult as the redistribution among the creditors. The German problem was largely an economic one. The redistribution problem was largely a political one.

So, unfortunately, from my point of view, the Young committee in Paris had to deal with these combined problems of economics and politics. If I show some dislike for Politics to-day, it results largely from my experience with her in Paris. Charming as she may be at times on the stage, she is often petulant and petty, and always selfish in the dressing rooms, and, habitually, she puts a low estimate on the intelligence of her audience.

BEST THAT COULD BE DONE

However, as I say, a settlement was made in Paris. It was the best settlement that could be made. Strictly speaking, it was neither an economic settlement nor a political one. It was a compromise between the two.

The compromise was difficult. Both Politics and Economics in all countries had been waiting for this day of final settlement to even up some of their old scores. Things which had been said and actions which had been taken, things which had been left unsaid and actions which had been withheld, were now to be brought on the stage for the last time.

So in a sense our committee at Paris was compelled to review and reargue and, so far as possible, adjust all of the conflicts involving reparations and their redistribution and everything collateral thereto which had arisen during the preceding 10-year period. Questions of parity and ratios, which are so important to guns and ships, were not by any means absent in dealing with a limitation program expressed in currency.

Perhaps you will pardon me if I stop here long enough to pay a slight tribute to my associates in Paris. They were men of competence and independence in thought and action. Economic theorists could not dominate them. They had the highest regard for the specialized expert, but they also had experience in making practical application of expert theories. Financial or business interests could not coerce them. They had the greatest respect for men of business, but they were not blind to the large social and political factors also involved. Politics could not control them, because they held no public offices and were not responsible to political constituencies.

FRIENDSHIP A FACTOR OF SUCCESS

From such a group only could a settlement come. That does not mean that it could come from these individuals only, but it does mean that individuals, to be successful, must have the qualifications which I have indicated. Then, too, the members of this committee had the good fortune of intimate personal acquaintance. Most of them had been friends for many years. This was a contributing factor to success.

I wish I might take the time to speak of each member of the committee individually and give you some idea of the value of his contribution, particularly as to my American associates. It must suffice here for me to say that no man ever had more competent and loyal associates than I had in J. P. Morgan, Thomas W. Lamont, and Thomas Nelson Perkins. The respect in which they held each other and in which they were held by their European associates had a very great influence on our work.

Whether the burden placed on Germany is too great, only time will tell. It is true that the countries participating in the Paris plan have added all of their indebtedness to the United States together, and added approximately 50 per cent to it, in fixing the sum which Germany is to pay. Each of those countries, you will remember, had protested against the burden of their indebtedness to the United States even under the favorable debt settlements made.

Yet they have paid Germany the compliment of assuming that she can bear the burden of them all, together with a substantial premium.

But I have great confidence in Germany's capacity to pay. True, she has not a large supply of what the world calls basic raw material. She has, in large measure, however, a supply of that kind of raw material too little taken into account in the world's affairs, namely, a capacity for scientific research, and the ability to apply it and organize it in production. It is not unlikely that in the years to come this particular kind of raw material with which Germany is well endowed may be the reservoir-out of which these vast sums will be produced and paid.

If Germany does make the payments out of such a reservoir, the rest of the world must be careful to avoid the enervating effects resulting from the receipt of such payments. We should all remember that the discipline of hard work and of heavy responsibility is likely to do much for a people as well as for an individual. Let no man be sure, let no

nation be sure, merely because he is a creditor of some one else's labor, that therefore he is strong and will always remain so.

THE INTERNATIONAL BANK

The most striking feature of the new plan is the Bank for International Settlements. That institution is unlike anything which has existed in the world before. It was not created merely for the sport of inflaming the imagination of men, or even for the laudable purpose of providing a new subject for the debaters of the world. Like all inventions and new creations, it arose out of the mind of man to meet a new need.

Obligations, as I have said, are to be delivered by Germany of approximately \$9,000,000,000, payable over a period of nearly 60 years, in fixed annual installments. As these obligations mature, vast sums must be paid over frontiers and translated into the currencies of other countries. Who should hold these obligations and control these transfers?

Should they be put in the hands of political treasuries of more than a dozen nations, where, in case of slight difficulties, they might become the football of domestic or international politics? Even more dangerous would it be to have them become the trading medium in all kinds of international negotiations.

Should they be left where Germany, if she chose, might default in the payments to one power and continue those to another?

Should they be left where these transfers in political hands might become a menace to the normal economic exchanges of the world?

No; it was quite apparent in the interest of all, creditor and debtor alike, that these obligations of Germany should be held and the payments managed by a single organization for the account and benefit of all. Any default by Germany must be a common default for all creditors. Any moratorium must be a common moratorium. Therefore it seemed to our committee necessary to mobilize the German obligations in single hands.

STATUS OF THE INSTITUTION

For that purpose the Bank for International Settlements was created. Any difficulties in German payments must be between Germany and the bank. The bank should be, as far as possible, insulated from politics, both domestic and international, and be free from government domination and control. To accomplish this the charter and by-laws of the bank were established by international treaty and evidenced by a protocol signed at The Hague on January 20 of this year. Corporate entity is to come into existence by an act of the Legislature of Switzerland, where the bank is to be located, Switzerland being a party to the treaty.

The capital of the bank is to be \$100,000,000 and its stock is to be sold to private persons in the principal countries of the world. Its directorate is to consist principally of the governors of the central banks of Europe or their nominees, America having declined to participate.

The earning power of the bank is to come from small commissions on reparation payments, and certain deposits from governmental treasuries provided in the plan. The bank has power to accept deposits from or to make deposits in central banks of countries on a gold-exchange basis. Thus the endeavor has been made in the interest of the world to eliminate politics from the control of reparation payments, and from the machinery which will handle them. The bank is to be truly the insulator between the political treasuries of the creditor powers and their debtor, Germany.

THINGS THE BANK CAN NOT DO

The bank is in no sense a superbank. It can not operate in any country in which the central bank of that country objects. It can not issue demand notes in any form, and therefore there is no danger of an international currency.

It may be used as a clearing house by central banks to the extent which they may elect to do so. This lies in the future. But there is no question in my mind that some such development will come about if the diminishing supply of gold in the world threatens a general deflation in the price level. The proper handling of price stability is one of the most important matters facing the capitalistic system to-day. In it will be found the roots of those maladjustments which result in the unequal and unfair distribution of wealth, in unemployment, and other serious problems.

The international bank may turn out to be an essential and useful piece of machinery for an economic world which of necessity is becoming more and more closely integrated. Politics becomes dangerous on a stage so small unless economics function well. Fortunately the bank has the power of growth, but it will grow only as our needs compel it. It will grow only as the central banks of the world wish to use it. In a word, it is the servant of all and the master of none.

WILL STAY INDEPENDENT OF LEAGUE

The question has been raised whether the League of Nations and the Bank for International Settlements might not unite their forces. The league represents international political cooperation, and the bank international financial cooperation. Well, if that means that the bank will come under the domination of the league, and so there will be added to the political forces of the league the financial resources of the bank,

I think we may dismiss once and for all our fears if we are opposed to the league, or our hopes if we are its proponents.

Nothing is clearer, from the experience of the last 10 years, than the necessity of keeping our economic machinery, and especially our finance, free from the domination and control of politics. That seems to me one great lesson which we have learned. I do not mean that the struggle of politics to control economics is ended. It is going on in every country, and will continue to do so.

But what about the relationship of economics to politics in international cooperation? Well, my answer is this: Economic integration of the world is a necessary prerequisite to effective political cooperation in the world. America, as the greatest creditor Nation, is more interested than any other in economic integration. It is inevitable that from an economic point of view she take an interest in and be concerned in the material problems and affairs of every country on the globe.

OUR ISOLATION SEEN AS IMPOSSIBLE

Isolation to America, either economic or political, is impossible. The material development of countries will necessarily be to us a matter of great concern, both from an idealistic and practical point of view. If all peoples everywhere could be lifted in productive capacity and consuming power to a point equal to our own, envy and hatred would be alleviated; capital would be better employed; markets would be enlarged; unemployment would diminish, and a much more peaceful world would be insured.

Let no man think that the living standards of America can be permanently maintained at a measurably higher level than those of the other civilized countries. Either we shall lift theirs to ours or they will drag ours down to theirs. Tariffs and other petty political barriers, temporarily justifiable, will, in the long run, only accentuate the trouble.

Our experience at home during the last generation should teach us that segregation into different groups for the selfish purpose of benefiting one at the expense of the other is a failure. It was not so many years ago that our industrial leaders in the United States thought that a low wage scale was necessary to enable capital to earn a profit. Now, we have learned that a high wage scale may be consistent not only with low production costs but also with the greatest security to and return on capital investment.

In a word, we are learning in America that the highest welfare of all rather than of any class is a wise objective, even for the group previously privileged. How long will it take us to learn that fact in a world so small that Commander Byrd talks from New Zealand on Wednesday at noon in the fall of the year with Adolph S. Ochs in Schenectady, on Tuesday at 7.30 a. m. in the spring of the year—and that conversation can be heard by practically everybody in the world at varying times and seasons.

MUST PASS POLITICAL FRONTIERS

It is too late, in our own interest, to think in terms of selfish isolation. To secure the advantages of economic equilibrium we must go beyond political frontiers. We may sign great declarations of peace, but we shall concurrently find, if we follow a narrow economic policy, an increasing resistance in countries less well off than ourselves to that disarmament, which is the insurance of the peace we seek. Politics in America may start a program which Politics can not stop.

After all, we must remember that Politics and Economics are not the masters of men—they are their servants. The managers of both too often think and sometimes act as if human beings were merely the fodder of political and economic mills. Merely because I have spoken of economics and politics I would not wish you to think that I consider them in any sense ends in themselves. Back of them stand myriads of human faces, some young, some old, some prosperous, some needy, some charitable, some selfish, some generous, some envious, but all vitally affected not only in their material but in their cultural and spiritual development by these organizations, political and economic, which they have imposed upon themselves.

So long as such organizations render an uplifting service, just so long can we go forward in reaping the advantages which civilization has brought. But those faces in these days of a closely compact world can no longer be segregated into compartments, one of which shall be prosperous and the others not; one of which shall go forward and the others back. Those faces must all move together for good or ill. So Politics and Economics, their servants, must move together; too, not in one country alone but everywhere. That way only can the benefits of civilization be enlarged—that way only can peace come.

AMERICA TOO RICH TO BE LOVED

And one word more. America is too rich to be loved. She is well enough off to be envied. The attitude of the world toward her will be largely influenced by her spirit.

If it be one of selfishness in isolation, she will have failed in her great responsibilities. If it be one of boastfulness in her success, she will have misused the things which God has given her.

I pray for sober and sensible responsibility, a spirit of gratitude for the things we have, a spirit of friendliness and helpfulness and co-

operation for all, a spirit of restraint in the use of any power which has been intrusted to us, and, most of all, restraint in speech.

"If drunk with sight of power we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe,
* * * * *
For frantic boast and foolish word
Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord."

CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] delivered in the National Radio Forum over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the subject of Campaign Expenditures.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I have been requested to speak to you to-night upon the subject of "Campaign Expenditures" and in view of the approaching election I feel it quite appropriate.

In the now famous case of Truman H. Newberry, the friends of Mr. Newberry offered a resolution, which passed the Senate of the United States, stating, "that Newberry be declared a duly elected Senator from the State of Michigan for the term of six years" and it also declared that "the expenditure of such excessive sums in behalf of a candidate, either with or without his knowledge and consent, being contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the honor and dignity of the Senate, and dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government, such excessive expenditures are hereby severely condemned and disapproved." Having first seated Mr. Newberry, the Senate of the United States then declared that the acts which he had committed or permitted to be committed were harmful to the honor and dignity of the Senate and dangerous to the perpetuity of free government. It was as if the judge of a court should say to the defendant, "I find you guilty but permit you to go free to ply your trade as before."

In the short space of time allotted to me this evening, it will be impossible for me to discuss all of the phases of campaign contributions, but at the outset I want to say that I am not so much interested in the amount of money that is raised as I am in the sources from which it is collected and the method by which it is expended. It seems to me that it must be apparent to any thinking man that it is next to impossible to spend legitimately the huge sums of money which have been recently spent in some of the senatorial campaigns, and, of course, the evidence before the committees of Congress showed that the inevitable did happen, and that the money was used for the purpose of corralling the illiterate voters of some of the big cities and in employing thousands of workers on election day, which was merely a subterfuge for buying votes.

Bribery and corruption in elections are not new in the history of the peoples of the world, but it has had a far-reaching effect upon most civilizations, whether it was in Rome, England, or some other country. In order that those who scoff and seek to ridicule some of us who are insisting upon the purity of the ballot box, let me briefly recall how the crime of bribery in elections was looked upon and what effect it had in some of the other countries. Let us for a brief moment see what took place in Rome.

Bribery in elections was one of the first symptoms of the decay of the great Roman Empire. Patriotic statesmen of that time clearly saw that it would end the liberties of the Roman people and the people instinctively felt that they must throttle this evil if they were to continue to exist as a free people. As early as 180 B. C. Lex Cornelia punished bribery of voters with exile, but severe as this penalty was, the abuses continued and increased. Heavy fines were added and citizens were deprived from holding office, but in spite of what was supposed to be the strong Roman character, financiers and politicians of that day trampled it beneath their reckless and sordid feet and were able to prevent the execution of the laws because of the growing indifference of the Roman people themselves. "Sufficient unto the day are the benefits thereof," became the unspoken rule which guided the great body of that once mighty people. The Roman citizen had become debauched, so far that he was ready to cast his suffrage for anybody who would do him any favor or even entertain him. Bribery in all its forms, gross and subtle, had utterly corrupted Roman character. The financiers and politicians understood this well and laughed at the corrupt practice act because they knew they could disregard it.

Is there no parallel between this absence of Roman civic virtue and the low ideals of the politicians and voters in some of our large cities to-day? Listen to Mr. Mackey, mayor of Philadelphia, when he testified before a committee of the Senate:

"Senator KING. But they vote the Republican ticket?"

"Mr. MACKEY. Absolutely [laughter] because the leader is Republican. When they move from one ward to another and you ask them what ticket they voted in the last division, they will say, 'Eddie Green.' He happens to be the leader in one division. That is the way they are loyal."

"Senator KING. What proportion of voters in Philadelphia reside in the wards you just referred to?"

"Mr. MACKAY. About one-third."

"Senator KING. Then one-third of the voters in Philadelphia have no knowledge of American institutions, but just follow their leader?"

Now let us for a brief moment turn to England. By the English common law, bribery was treated as treason, especially in the case of judges. Lord Chief Justice Thorp was beheaded for accepting bribes. The Earl of Middlesex was fined £50,000, one quarter of a million dollars.

We all recall the terrible fate imposed upon one of the greatest intellects in Great Britain—Lord Bacon—that mighty man in law and philosophy.

Bribery in elections as well as of public officials went hand-in-hand in England and began to be scandalously noticed under the Stuarts. It grew until its highest reign of corruption came under George III, from whom our forefathers successfully rebelled.

If we accept the philosophy of the defenders of huge campaign contributions, we never should have rebelled against George III. That monarch was a superb practical politician. He would be greatly admired by a certain class of American politicians were he living to-day. Indeed, George III would compare favorably with our so-called ablest party managers. He used offices to influence votes in Parliament. He distributed cash in order to secure election of members of Parliament; he resorted to every device of political manipulation so much admired in the United States by some of our financiers and so-called stand-pat politicians. He was highly skilled in the technique of influence, thoroughly practiced in the art of practical politics. He would have been one of the first to join with the Senator from New Hampshire in denouncing the progressive Democrats and Republicans of the Northwest as the "sons of wild jackasses," and he would likewise have been one of the first to have thought that after insulting them he could get them back into the party fold in exchange for "30 pieces of silver," as it is apparent the Old Guard are seeking to do with the progressives at this time by promising to assist them financially in the coming elections. But unless I miss my guess, you will not find the progressive Republican elections tainted with the corrupt funds of the Old Guard politicians.

The present corrupt practice act of the United Kingdom grew out of the so-called practical politics of George III. In support of my statement of the common law as it relates to corruption, I read from Shepherd on the law of elections as follows: "Bribery by a candidate, though in one instance and though a majority of unbribed votes remain in his favor, will void the particular election and disqualify him from being reelected to fill such vacancy."

The Senate of the United States has never adopted the harsh rule that has been adopted in Great Britain by their courts, namely, that bribery of one elector by a candidate or his party managers or agents without his knowledge or consent will void the whole election. It has never been necessary to do so in this country for the reason that in all of the cases where Senators have been refused seats there has not only been evidence of expenditures of huge sums of money which shock the sensibilities of decent people but there has likewise been evidence that it came from corrupt sources or had been used to corrupt the electorate of the country. As an example of wholesale corruption I call your attention to what took place in Allegheny County, Pa., where 11,000 people were put on the pay roll on election day. They were, according to Senator CARAWAY, taken from the largest families so as to get the most for their money. It was a device for buying votes.

Justice Keating, a British jurist, in the Norwich case said: "It seems hard at first sight that a single act of bribery should void an election, but when an act of bribery is committed, the whole election of the party bribed is tainted. It is no longer an election. It is utterly void."

I cite these authorities to show the policy of the people of Great Britain in dealing with this public cancer which grew to such magnitude under George III and which has ended the life of more than one great nation.

The argument is always made in these cases that it is hard on the candidate and that the people of a State have a right to select whomsoever they see fit to represent them in the United States Senate regardless of whether or not he corrupts the voters by the expenditures of money in the primaries to such an extent that British courts have held and the Senate of the United States has held that it is dangerous to the perpetuity of free institutions. Those who would defend this sort of thing on the ground that it is hard on the candidate or on the ground that it is entirely within the province of the State to elect that sort of a man overlook entirely that fact that our forefathers in drafting the Constitution provided that the Senate of the United States should be the judge of the qualifications of their own Members, and they entirely overlook the fact that the office is not created to satisfy the ambitions of any candidate. The office was created as an instrument of the people who made it and it does not belong to the candidate but belongs to the people of the United States.

It might be well to ask what had been the results of this drastic treatment of corruption by the English law and English courts? First of all, from a greater debauchery of elections than the world ever knew

since the time of the fall of the Roman Empire, England has developed into a period of remarkable purity of elections. Purity of elections is of utmost public consequence.

Why are large contributions made to political parties in the United States? Listen to the testimony given by Senator GRUNDY before the lobby committee. Mr. GRUNDY after testifying to the large sums of money which he collected for the Republican national committee was questioned by Senator CARAWAY, as follows:

"Senator CARAWAY. They put up the money to bring that mandate about and they ought to get the legislation they bought and paid for?"

"Mr. GRUNDY. If that platform was put into law they would get their money back."

"Senator CARAWAY. They would get their money back?"

"Mr. GRUNDY. Yes, sir."

"Senator CARAWAY. And you were down here to see that they got their money back?"

"Mr. GRUNDY. Yes, sir. I was helping every way I could."

Here is a frank and open statement by Mr. GRUNDY of the reasons why great campaign funds are collected. It is for the purpose of influencing legislation in favor of those seeking special favors at the hands of Congress.

It is not uncommon to hear it said that if such legislation is passed, the party responsible for its passage will not be able to receive revenue for party purposes.

The extensive use of money in elections in this country did not really begin until the early nineties. In 1896 one of the most successful national politicians this country has ever produced, Mark Hanna, whose daughter, RUTH HANNA MCCORMICK, just received the Republican nomination for Senator in the State of Illinois, managed McKinley's campaign. He systemized and developed a practice which was rooted deep in the soil of American politics, namely, the practice of assessing corporations and business men who might be benefited or injured by legislative action. The campaign fund of 1896 was unprecedented in its size and in the rapidity with which it was collected during the closing days of the campaign. Mr. Hanna established the necessary connections with financial circles and then organized the collection of contributions as carefully as he had previously organized the distribution of reading matter. Banks, insurance companies, and other large corporations were assessed in accordance with their wealth and in accordance with the benefits which they were supposed to receive. As a corollary to the practice of assessing corporations, it was found that large corporations would contribute to both parties in order to make sure that their business interests would be protected whichever was in power. Sometimes the money was given freely and voluntarily and sometimes it was demanded by political leaders.

Following the enactment of the Federal law prohibiting corporate contributions, men of great wealth connected with great enterprises would give the money. This was the case of Mr. Smith in Illinois, for whose campaign Mr. Insull, connected with the public-service corporations in Illinois and throughout the country, put up most of his money.

While corrupt practices acts have been enacted in practically all of the States in the Union to-day, and we have a law upon the statute books of the United States passed in 1925 relating to the election of United States Senators, there is no law upon the statute books at the present time relating to primary elections of persons to the United States Senate or to Congress.

The first national publicity law was passed in 1910. The next year the law was amended extending its application to candidates for nomination and election to the offices of Representatives and Senators in Congress. Another amendment was passed in 1918. These constitute the sum total of the Federal laws up to 1925.

The decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Newberry case was a severe blow to those who favored legislation prohibiting corrupt practices in elections. The Newberry case was a 5-to-4 decision, 5 members of the Supreme Court holding the law unconstitutional, 4 members holding in substance that Congress had no authority to pass laws regulating primary expenditures, and 1 member of the court, Mr. Justice McKenna, holding it unconstitutional because it was passed before the enactment of the law providing for the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people.

While we have no adequate laws upon the statute books dealing with campaign expenditures and their uses, the Constitution of the United States, in section 5, Article I, referring to the House and Senate, reads: "Each House shall be the judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own Members." There is no limitation of this power. The Senate of the United States in the Vare case and in the Smith case decided under this provision that they were empowered to refuse seats to these men and did so. The undisputed testimony was that Vare spent to secure his nomination in the neighborhood of \$800,000 and Mr. Smith spent something like \$450,000.

Let there be no mistake about this matter. Those who are seeking seats in the United States Senate in the coming elections might just as well make up their minds that if they expend huge sums of money in corrupting the voters of their States they will be denied seats in the upper branch of the Congress of the United States of America, because

the Senate is determined as far as that body is concerned to prevent the seats in that body from being bought and sold on the auction block.

Why shouldn't they? It is not a question of personal fortunes, feelings, or career of the Senator elect applying for admission; if that were the only thing involved, it could and would be undoubtedly forgiven; but it is the integrity of the election that is in question and the election to a seat in the Senate of the United States. What does that mean? What duties devolve upon a Member of the United States Senate? They are the most varied and far-reaching with which any officer under any free government is clothed in any country in the world to-day.

We ratify every treaty with foreign nations; only by the advice and consent of the Members of this body are appointment to office made under the laws and Constitution of the United States.

We pass upon every law affecting taxation, tariff, interstate and foreign commerce, banking, trusts, and our great undeveloped natural resources. Nor is that all; we are also members of a court, the highest court known to man; we alone can try the impeachment of judges of the Nation; the Senate of the United States is the only tribunal that can unseat a President.

You are all familiar with the powers of the Senate. I enumerate them only that we may understand the magnitude of the election to that body. The founders of this Nation placed in the hands of the United States Senator as much power, if not more, than any other official of the Government. Therefore, it is expected that the election to a place in that body would be defended zealously, determinedly, and fiercely by the people and if not the people by the Senate itself, not because of personal feelings of the individual Senators in regard to the matter but in order that our institutions might not be polluted at the fountain head.

Ladies and gentlemen, the voting polls of this country must not be made a market place. The electorate of this country must not be debauched. With the concentration of wealth into fewer and fewer hands, public opinion must be aroused to the necessity of becoming more and more vigilant for the protection of their own rights and privileges. I am glad to stand here to-night before this microphone and issue a warning to those who are seeking entrance into the upper body of Congress that they must come here with clean hands and even though they may be successful in debauching the electorate of their own State, they will not be successful in obtaining a seat in the Senate of the United States.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have spoken to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], who has charge of the unfinished business, the immigration bill, and he is perfectly willing that it shall be temporarily laid aside so that I may call up the independent offices appropriation bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside for that purpose.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9546) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JONES. I ask that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with, that the bill may be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments may be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] has had charge of this bill. He has not been feeling well for several days and asked me to ask the Senate to proceed with its consideration, as he does not want to have it delayed any longer. It is urgent, of course, that we should get all the appropriation bills disposed of as soon as possible. That is the reason why I am taking it up at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission," on page 19, at the end of line 20, to strike out "\$1,040,000" and insert "\$1,160,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For all other authorized expenditures of the Federal Trade Commission in performing the duties imposed by law or in pursuance of law, including secretary to the commission and other personal services, contract stenographic reporting services to be obtained on and after the approval of this act by the commission, in its discretion, through the civil service or by contract, or renewal of existing contract, or otherwise, supplies and equipment, law books, books of reference,

periodicals, garage rental, traveling expenses, including not to exceed \$900 for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the commission, at meetings concerned with the work of the Federal Trade Commission, not to exceed \$300 for newspapers, payments for which may be made in advance, not to exceed \$200 for newspaper clippings, foreign postage, and witness fees and mileage in accordance with section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission act, \$1,500,000, of which amount not to exceed \$1,160,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, including witness fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission," on page 26, line 19, to strike out "\$2,540,000" and insert "\$3,547,313," so as to read:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks, bonds, and other securities, approved March 1, 1913 (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 19a), including one director of valuation at \$10,000 per annum, one supervisor of land appraisals, one supervising engineer, one supervisor of accounts, and one principal valuation examiner, at \$9,000 each per annum, and traveling expenses, \$3,547,313.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, at the end of line 17, to increase the total appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission, from \$8,322,650 to \$9,329,963.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, at the end of line 10, to increase the total amount appropriated in the bill from \$552,514,753 to \$553,522,066.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. JONES. I offer the following amendment in behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 37, line 8, strike out "\$4,900" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,000, of which \$1,100 shall be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. I offer now the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 39, line 3, after the word "ships," insert:

Including operation through an agreement to pay a lump-sum compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, recently we authorized a deficiency appropriation to print the works of Washington as a memorial. I had intended to have an amendment providing the apportionment necessary to be expended in the fiscal year ready for insertion in this bill, but unfortunately we did not get the data soon enough and we have not been able to get the item through the Bureau of the Budget. Consequently I wish to announce to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that I hope to have that item ready for the next deficiency appropriation bill, because it will be very embarrassing if we overlook it.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent that the clerks at the desk may be authorized to correct the totals where necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Wisconsin moves to insert on page 21, after line 24:

Washington, D. C., Government Hotel for Government workers: For maintenance, operation, and management of the hotel and restaurants therein, including purchase and replacement of equipment and personal services, and including not to exceed \$300 for the repair and maintenance of an automobile for official use, \$250,000, of which amount not to exceed \$159,240 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia in addition to any meals and lodging allowed employees: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$5,000 per annum, in addition to any meals and lodging, and only one person may be employed at that rate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, this has been estimated for, so it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, briefly explaining the amendment, I want to say that it reinstates in the appropriation bill the language which was in the appropriation act for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1930, with some change in the amount of the appropriation. The amount proposed for the next fiscal year by this amendment is less than was provided for the current fiscal year.

The amendment is designed to continue the operation of what are known as the Government Hotels. Senators will recall that the Government Hotels were formerly operated in temporary buildings just opposite the Senate Office Building to the west. By an act of Congress those buildings were ordered to be torn down to make way for the plaza between the Capitol and the Union Station. The Government Hotels operations were continued in similar buildings which were constructed during the war and for war-time purposes, which are now just north of where the Government Hotels were formerly operated. The proposal is to continue the operation for just one year.

I want to suggest that a census is being taken, and as a result thereof there will be several thousand additional clerks employed in the District of Columbia. Many of those clerks will be women, and if the five or six hundred women now domiciled in the Government Hotels must find other quarters beginning July 1 in all probability there will be a great congestion respecting housing conditions for the Government clerks. The purpose, therefore, is merely to continue the occupancy and operation of the buildings for another year.

Of course I understand there is a celebration in 1932 proposed to be held in the District and it is desired that these buildings be wrecked and cleared away before the commencement of that celebration. This amendment, however, will not prevent the removal of the buildings in time for the celebration. In fact, there will be quite sufficient time to tear down the buildings and to improve the land. The improvement, of course, will not be extensive. It will consist primarily in filling in old cellars, leveling the ground and planting some shrubs, all of which can be accomplished long prior to the opening of the celebration.

I think it is only fair to the women employees of the Government to permit them to continue in these buildings just as long as possible. Particularly is it desirable to permit them to continue there in view of the fact that there will be an influx here of thousands and thousands of additional clerical employees necessary to take care of the compilation of the census. The purpose of the amendment is simply to take care of that temporary period.

Mr. President, these hotels are being operated without any expense whatever to the Government. They pay their own way. In fact, they more than pay their own way. There is a considerable surplus on hand at the present time. The women who have been occupying the buildings ought to have the benefit of that surplus for at least the balance of the possible time when the Government Hotels can be operated without bringing about any inconvenience whatever to the Government or the contemplated celebration.

I have here the House hearings relating to the independent offices appropriation bill for 1931, and I will quote from page 156 respecting the receipts and disbursements of Government Hotels:

The Government Hotels, which have operated with a plant of reduced capacity since July 1, 1929, continue to give excellent room and food service to 600 guests—

The "guests" are women who are employed by the Government—

pressing the limit of their room accommodations; to furnish towel laundry service to practically all Government departments in Washington, and to maintain buildings which are utilized for housing other branches of the Government.

These hotels have been used for more than merely the housing of women employees.

Costs of operation (appropriation disbursements) are maintained under the revenue return (cash receipts deposited in the United States Treasury). Figures of operation follow. The excess of receipts over expenditures is not profit in the sense of business accounting, for interest and depreciation upon capital outlay is not taken into consideration.

For the fiscal year 1929 the excess in receipts over disbursements was \$7,556.12, according to this report, and according to the evidence in the hearings. For the fiscal year 1930 the excess was \$5,000; for the fiscal year 1931 it is estimated that the excess will be \$20,000. I find that the total excess of receipts over disbursements during the operation of these hotels has been \$300,902.92. Following the table from which I have quoted are the estimates for 1931, as stated by Mrs. Andrews, but it is not necessary for the purpose of my remarks to go into details. However, I ask that the table to which I have referred may be inserted at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

	Expenditures	Receipts
Salaries.....	\$31,250	
Contingent expenses.....	4,000	
Printing and binding.....	600	
Collections.....	11,000	
Maintenance, unsold property.....	100	
Miscellaneous, account property sold.....	2,000	
Subtotal.....	48,950	\$774,500
Government Hotels.....	250,000	270,000
Total.....	298,950	1,044,500

Mr. BLAINE. The table shows that what I propose will not cost the Government one single dollar and that those who live at the hotels will bear the entire expense.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. Can the Senator from Wisconsin state the number of Government employees who are now occupying these buildings?

Mr. BLAINE. My information is, from what I have read, that there are about 600 women occupying those quarters.

Mr. FRAZIER. So that there is really need for a continuation of the service there?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes; I think there is a very pressing need for it.

I find on page 173 of the hearings that Mr. WASON makes this statement:

We will take up the item for the maintenance and operation of the Government Hotels, as follows.

Then there is a statement, which I need not quote, but continuing the evidence, I quote as follows:

Your current appropriation appears to be \$204,000 plus an unexpended balance of \$144,000, while the estimate for 1931 is \$250,000.

Mrs. Sumner, who, I understand, is in charge, said:

For the fiscal year 1931 the Government Hotel is asking for an appropriation of \$250,000, which is \$98,000 less than was granted for the current year. This decrease is made possible by the gradual decrease in the number of buildings operated. During the summer six dormitories, one administration building, and the infirmary were razed to make way for the park which is to stretch from the Capitol to the Union Station. The kitchen, dining room, and the infirmary were transferred to buildings in the Plaza group. This necessitated the moving of approximately 400 guests who were living in the Capitol group.

Then the statement goes on in more detail, which it is not necessary to quote. Further quoting from page 176, Mr. WOODRUM, putting interrogatories, asked this question:

What rates does the Government hotel charge the guests?

Mrs. SUMNER. Fifty dollars per month for a single room.

Mr. WOODRUM. And how many meals?

Mrs. SUMNER. Two meals.

Mr. WOODRUM. Your request for appropriations for 1931 is practically the same as your appropriation for the current year.

Mrs. SUMNER. We are asking this year for \$250,000, and last year we actually spent \$280,465.42. That is the actual expenditure for the fiscal year 1929.

Mr. WOODRUM. That would be a decrease of \$30,000.

Mrs. SUMNER. That is the actual amount expended. If you will notice, last year we were granted \$348,000, and this year we are asking \$250,000, which is \$98,000 less than the amount we were granted last year.

She testified at the time these hearings were held that there were 550 women living there instead of 600, the number which I mentioned in my reply to the Senator from North Dakota, and 350 taking meals there. Mrs. Sumner further testified:

Guests pay different rates, according to the room desired. With two in a room the rate is \$22.50 each; single room, \$25; small double, \$35; large double, \$37.50.

What I have quoted is sufficient to give the essential details of the operation of the Government Hotels.

Mr. President, the women employees of the Government residing there are very vitally interested in this matter. They have sent to me a petition which contains names from 43 States. In other words, there are living at the Government Hotels women who come from 43 out of the 48 States of the Union, and 14

come from the District of Columbia. The only States which have no representation at the Government hotels are Arizona, Idaho, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Wyoming. All the other States have representation there.

I have here before me the petition, together with the number who signed from each State. I will ask that the schedule of the number be made a part of my remarks at this point, and I present the petition signed by these guests, to be disposed of in the usual way that petitions are ordinarily disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paper referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the Record, and the petition will lie on the table.

The paper referred to is as follows:

Number from each of 43 States who signed Government Hotel petition

Alabama	6
Arkansas	2
California	7
Colorado	5
Connecticut	4
Delaware	5
Florida	6
Georgia	13
Illinois	36
Indiana	20
Iowa	15
Kansas	5
Kentucky	16
Louisiana	5
Maine	7
Maryland	27
Massachusetts	35
Michigan	7
Minnesota	16
Mississippi	4
Missouri	24
Montana	2
Nebraska	9
New Hampshire	3
New Jersey	10
New Mexico	1
New York	52
North Carolina	5
North Dakota	1
Ohio	28
Oklahoma	2
Oregon	1
Pennsylvania	41
South Carolina	2
South Dakota	3
Tennessee	16
Texas	4
Utah	1
Vermont	6
Virginia	20
Washington	5
West Virginia	4
Wisconsin	11
District of Columbia	14
Paris, France	1

States not represented: Arizona, Idaho, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Wyoming.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I merely wish to read what the petitioners say:

A PETITION TO CONGRESS, DATED AT WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 11, 1930

We, the undersigned, residents of the Government Hotels in Washington, D. C., hereby petition Congress to amend H. R. 9546 to carry the appropriation estimated by the Bureau of the Budget for operation of the Government Hotels for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931.

In view of the fact that the work of the 1930 census will bring to Washington this year between 6,000 and 7,000 clerks, whose entrance salaries will range from \$1,260 to \$1,440 per annum, we believe such action would be especially wise and just at this time.

The additional clerks who are coming to Washington will receive small salaries. If these 550 or 600 guests shall be removed from the Government Hotels it will mean congestion in other rooming houses, which no doubt will lead to an increase in rentals. I submit that the clerks who are coming, who are going to be temporary employees, will be burdened with a heavy rental while they are receiving only a very small salary. Furthermore, the women who have occupied these buildings are entitled to consideration from the fact that they have paid the entire cost of this operation and yielded a profit to the Government.

Further quoting from the petition they say:

We further express the hope that the operation of the Government Hotels may be continued at least until such time as action can be had on bill S. 1157, authorizing the construction of permanent dormitories for women employees in Government service.

The bill to which they refer is a bill introduced by me some time ago, providing for a dormitory system for the women employees of the Government in the District of Columbia. The provisions of that bill outline a plan by which the employees would pay for the construction and operation of such dormitories, asking the Government only to advance the necessary

funds for capital account out of which to erect the buildings and equip them. I will not discuss that bill at this time.

So, Mr. President, under the circumstances, I trust that the chairman of the committee will accept this amendment applying to the next fiscal year, one year from now. Of course, under the circumstances we can not hope to continue the Government Hotels in operation beyond June 30, 1931. I repeat, I trust that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment; and if not, that the Senate will adopt the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I desire to know if the Senator can inform me as to when it is contemplated to begin the razing of the Government buildings under the present plan?

Mr. BLAINE. I presume those in charge might begin to raze those buildings any time after July 1, 1930, but the necessity therefor will not obtain until at least a year from then. It does not take very long to raze such buildings and make the improvements which are contemplated. A year will be ample time. I remember that it only took a short time to raze the buildings opposite the Senate Office Building which have been torn down, and, had the grounds been improved, it would only have taken a short time to make those improvements.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I am heartily in sympathy with the idea of continuing in operation, for a while at least, these buildings as Government Hotels. I think the women employees who reside in them are entitled to that much consideration. If we go ahead and destroy the buildings, in all probability the ground will stand idle and be an eyesore, just as is the case on the block to the west of the Senate Office Building, where the buildings have been destroyed. On that site the buildings were razed many months ago, but nothing has been done toward improving the ground. That is one trouble in regard to improvements in the District of Columbia undertaken by the Government. The idea seems to be to begin pell-mell to destroy the buildings on every site which has been condemned and then allow the ground to stand idle for months and months, perhaps for a year or two at times. The result is a very unsightly condition.

The tenants in the buildings on the site where the new Supreme Court building is to be erected have been told that they were going to be moved out of those buildings on the 1st of June, and then on the 1st of July. A gentleman who lives there was talking to me only yesterday, and I understand the time has now been extended a little longer. In my opinion, when those in charge are ready to make the improvements, then they should raze the buildings on the property; but I do not believe in destroying buildings 6 or 12 months prior to the time when the improvements will be made, and in this particular instance I have no idea that the property will be improved for six months or a year, even if the buildings should be removed.

So, Mr. President, I think that some extension along the line suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin would be very wise and would not interfere at all with the Government's plan of making improvements. I desire that the improvements shall be made, but there is no use doing a foolish thing by withdrawing the privilege of the use of those buildings from the tenants 6 or 12 months prior to any necessity for doing so.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not feel that I can accept this amendment. This matter was presented to the House committee, and they left out this item; and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate did not feel justified in recommending its adoption.

Referring to the suggestion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], an estimate has been sent down—and I hope the Senator will note this—for \$3,614,668, which will doubtless be carried in the legislative appropriation bill and will be available the 1st day of July, for taking care of the very matter to which the Senator has referred; and that is one reason why these buildings should be removed as promptly as possible.

We have a Commission on Public Buildings, I think it is called, headed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. That commission has recommended that these buildings be taken away just as quickly as possible. Then we have a Commission on Enlarging the Capitol Grounds, of which our Vice President is chairman, and the Speaker of the House, Mr. LONGWORTH, and others are members of that commission. They have urged that these buildings be taken down for the very purpose of doing what the Senator suggests—beginning promptly to put these grounds in the shape in which they were intended to be. I understand, through the Architect of the Capitol, that they are prepared to start in to do that when this appropriation is made, practically on the 1st day of July.

One of the reasons, as I understand, why this matter is pressed is because of the Washington centennial exposition that we expect to have in 1932, when it is expected, of course, that

many thousands of the citizens of the country will come here; and it would really be an eyesore to have things in the condition they are in now with our people coming down to the National Capital upon an occasion of that kind.

As I understand, the preparation of the lands here where the buildings have already been razed is really awaiting the razing of these buildings, because it is a proposition that can be better carried on as one unit than if it were divided up into different units. The preparation of the one depends very largely upon the preparation of the other; and the plan to be carried out can be more properly carried out by taking the whole tract between here and the Union Station.

I think I should put in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter from the United States Housing Corporation. While I have heard nothing of the rumors referred to in this letter, evidently some have, and I think I am entirely justified in putting in this communication. The United States Housing Corporation says that its attention has been called to a rumor that that corporation is quietly or secretly working against the razing of these buildings. It desires that it should appear that this is not the case, and that it is cooperating in every way it can in regard to this situation.

I ask, therefore, that the letter may be printed in the RECORD. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF INDUSTRIAL HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION,
UNITED STATES HOUSING CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. DAVID LYNN,
Architect of the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LYNN: My attention has been called to a rumor that the United States Housing Corporation is tacitly, if not actively, encouraging a movement to secure the restoration of the 1931 appropriation for the operation of the Government Hotels.

The United States Housing Corporation is not a party to this movement but, in obedience to the will of Congress as expressed by the failure to appropriate for the hotels for the next fiscal year, is actively cooperating with you and the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds, to the end that the 14 buildings known as the Plaza Group may be vacated and turned over to your commission on July 1, 1930.

Respectfully,

UNITED STATES HOUSING CORPORATION,
LULAH T. ANDREWS, President.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not know of anything special that I might say. It is true, of course, that these buildings are housing four or five hundred Government employees. It is also true that possibly several thousand Government employees will be brought here temporarily in connection with the census. These accommodations for 550 will not go very far toward meeting that situation. As a matter of fact, I think I have seen it intimated or suggested—at any rate, it is likely to be intimated or suggested—that if the Government brings thousands of employees here, and furnishes what might be termed cheap quarters for five or six hundred, that is a very serious discrimination against those who are not furnished with such quarters, and who are just as deserving as those who may be housed in these quarters.

I have understood that an organization has been formed under which buildings are being constructed—some, I think, have already been constructed—primarily for Government employees. The matter is arranged so that they will pay a certain amount per month for their lodging and board, and a certain amount of this monthly payment is applied to the cost of the buildings and the property, so that in the end these buildings will belong to the Government employees or, I suppose, to an association representing them. Some of these buildings, I understand, have been completed. Some are now under way. Of course, this has been done, as I say, by private capital and under private organizations and private arrangements.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BLAINE. Does the Senator recall that he received a letter—I know that I did—from one of these corporations which are building so-called Government-employee hotels, soliciting the Congress of the United States to raise \$250,000, saying that they were going to be unable to carry out any project unless they had some money? Does the Senator recall receiving such a letter?

Mr. JONES. I do not recall receiving such a letter, but very likely I did. I receive a great many letters that I do not recall; but I do not recall having received such a letter. I do not question at all but that the Senator did, however.

Mr. BLAINE. I should like to ask the Senator if the two blocks just north of the Senate Office Building have not been vacant for years without any improvements?

Mr. JONES. They have.

Mr. BLAINE. And the two blocks just north of the Capitol, where the buildings were razed, have been vacant now for over a year, and no improvements have been put upon the ground.

Mr. JONES. But, as I said a moment ago, I take it—of course, I am not an architect or anything of that kind, and so my opinion may not be worth anything—I take it, however, that the improvement of these grounds should be carried on practically as one unit; and I assume that that is one reason why the property just north of the Senate Office Building has not been put in shape, although it is possible that the Government has not secured the title to some of the lands there until lately. On one of the corners across from the Senate Office Building, I think, there was an old building for a long time, and it was not razed until possibly a year ago, or something like that. That is only a surmise on my part as to the reason why that improvement has not been made.

Mr. BLAINE. Will the Senator yield for another question? Then I will desist.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BLAINE. Will not the Senator concede that beginning July 1, 1931, there will be ample time in which to raze these buildings and improve the grounds for the anticipated celebration? In fact, it will take only a short time to do the work, and yet there will be about a year in which to do it.

Mr. JONES. I doubt that very seriously. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] knows better about the plan for this centennial than I do. I do not know when they intend or expect to begin the exercises; but I take it that not only should they get these buildings off and the ground leveled, and all that, but that they ought to have a pretty good sod on this area as a park before the time set for the opening of the centennial. So if the razing of these buildings and putting in shape of these grounds is not commenced before June of 1931, we shall have nothing of that kind done in time for this centennial in 1932.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FESS. If the Senator will permit me, the matter has been discussed before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and also before the Park and Planning Commission, headed by Colonel Grant, and also by the Housing Commission, headed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot]. Complaint has been made that we have not been able to get more progress made toward clearing out these buildings and getting the grounds ready prior to 1932.

We had the assurance that this work would be begun on the 1st of July, or shortly after the 1st of July, of this year. Four years ago the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds considered the discontinuance or the razing of the hotels. At that time the question came up as to housing facilities, and our committee recommended the appointment of a survey commission to make a survey of the housing situation to determine whether or not we would be justified in razing the hotels.

That commission, in making its report, did not supply evidence that we ought to continue the hotels, but it took positive action to discontinue them; and the committee let the matter drift along until last year. Now it is in shape; they have ordered these buildings discontinued or razed, and some of them have been; but it has been done by piecemeal, taking the buildings next to the Capitol first and reserving the others until later.

I had some correspondence with parties who are interested in continuing these buildings. Being on the committee, naturally they applied to me. I notified them that we had been suspending the work on that sort of a plea now for six years. Every time the matter comes up, some one suggests that an emergency will arise, and that we ought not to do it. So I anticipated that there would be something of the kind in reference to the census; and I communicated with the Director of the Census as to the probable inflow of additional clerks. He said that there might possibly be 4,000 clerks brought here for this temporary purpose; that no suggestion had been made to him as to the matter of housing.

In view of the fact that we have been trying to do this for six years, and have not made progress, and especially in view of the fact that we have been deferring the time to get this ground ready for the celebration in 1932, I think it would be very unfortunate to continue these buildings another year; for, if we do, it is quite obvious that the situation will not be inviting in 1932.

The chairman of the committee has made a proper statement as to the reason of the delay. It is because it is desired to plan

the improvement as a whole. They have an idea of bringing in a new avenue that will cut from the Union Station into Pennsylvania Avenue somewhere between Second and Third Streets. That will necessitate taking possession of certain ground which we do not yet have. The ground beyond B Street we virtually have, but we do not have the ground between B Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. If we do defer this work for another year; if we do not take action now and allow this procedure to go on as it has been ordered—already the order is issued that these buildings shall be razed beginning with the 1st of July—if we defer it for another year, I am sure we are going to be very much embarrassed in getting those grounds ready for the celebration in 1932. If there were any real emergency in the case, it would appeal to me differently, but I do not see any emergency.

Mr. BLAINE. What is the date of the beginning of the celebration?

Mr. FESS. It is proposed to have the first celebration on the 31st of October next year, 1931. The first great performance in this city will be in February, 1932, a year from next February. If we let this go another year there will not be very much time.

Mr. BLAINE. Does not the Senator conceive that it will be utterly impossible for the Government to go through the necessary condemnation proceedings to acquire the property to be obtained for the new avenue or boulevard by that time?

Mr. FESS. Not as to all of it.

Mr. BLAINE. Such proceedings take a long time.

Mr. FESS. It is the serious contemplation to me, and I confess we are going to be somewhat disturbed over that very thing in getting ready by 1932; but I do hope we can get the grounds about the Union Station cleared up.

As I have said, if there were an emergency, I would not feel so deeply about going ahead with the work; in fact, I have sympathy with the suggestion which has been made in various quarters that there ought to be an effort to build in some section of the city, either through the cooperation of the employees here or in some other way, desirable edifices for those of the Government employees who would like to live under the conditions which obtain with regard to the present buildings. I would join in a movement of that kind, and I think it could be worked out to be a very desirable thing.

Mr. BLAINE. I am somewhat reliably informed that the President, who has been interested in the question of housing, and has discussed it a great deal, takes the same view of the matter. I do not mean that he has expressly declared it to Congress, but his attitude is favorable to that proposal.

Mr. FESS. I would look with favor on a proposal of that sort. I think it would be very worth while.

Mr. BLAINE. I want to ask the Senator if he does not believe that 60 or 90 days is a sufficient time to raze the buildings and do the leveling and other improving?

Mr. FESS. No; not to get the grounds in shape.

Mr. BLAINE. On the blocks which have been cleared the work was done within a few weeks.

Mr. FESS. Yes; but the grounds are in terrible shape, and will be for some time.

Mr. BLAINE. I appreciate that; but it would not take very long to prepare the ground.

Mr. FESS. I think it would, particularly after the ground had just been worked on, and with thousands upon thousands of people coming into the Capital. I think it would be very unfortunate to delay this matter another year.

Mr. BLAINE. In 1932 in all probability we will not find the two blocks north of the Senate Office Building improved and in all probability will not have this contemplated improvement completed.

Mr. FESS. I will be distressed if conditions in 1932 are as the Senator suggests.

Mr. BLAINE. My own impression is that that is not going to happen; but even if it does happen, I have no doubt there will be sufficient time to raze these buildings and make the improvements of the land essential and desirable by the 1st of October, 1931.

Mr. FESS. I fear not. I am quite convinced that if we permit this matter to go over another year there will be just the same effort that has been heretofore made for five years, and I think that would be very unwise. As I said to the Senator, if there were an emergency which we could not meet otherwise I would be inclined to yield to the pressure that is being made upon us. It has been made on me, as on others, but it does not seem to me that there is any emergency at all.

Mr. President, I think it would be very unfortunate, so near the time when we are planning the greatest celebration in the history of the world, not to take steps now to beautify the grounds about the station by removing the temporary buildings, which are not essential, as it appears to me, and whose removal

would only cause a little inconvenience to certain people which could be very easily relieved, and should not be considered as an argument against the beautifying of the city for the coming event.

I sincerely hope the House view in the matter, which is in accordance with the view of the commission of which the Vice President is a member, and the commission of which the Senator from Utah, the chairman of the Finance Committee, is chairman, will be agreed to. In view of the position the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has taken in recommending this action, and the decision to begin the razing of these buildings on July 1, I think it would be very unfortunate if we should interrupt that program now, and I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE].

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	George	Kean	Smoot
Ashurst	Gillett	Kendrick	Steck
Baird	Glass	McKellar	Stetwer
Black	Glenn	McNary	Stephens
Blaine	Goff	Norbeck	Sullivan
Borah	Gould	Norris	Swanson
Brookhart	Greene	Nye	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Hale	Overman	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Harris	Philpotts	Trammell
Caraway	Harrison	Pittman	Tydings
Connally	Hatfield	Ransdell	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hayden	Robinson, Ind.	Wagner
Couzens	Hebert	Robinson, Ky.	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Heflin	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Howell	Shipstead	Watson
Fess	Johnson	Shortridge	Wheeler
Frazier	Jones	Simmons	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of to-day's business the Senate shall adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can remain in the Chamber only a few moments, but I desire to say a word about the pending amendment. I understand the question is in regard to abolishing the old shacks, the hotels between the Capitol and the Union Station.

I hope the Senate will take no action other than what has been decided upon by the Public Buildings Commission. The removal of those buildings has been postponed and postponed. We have tried in every way to make room for the occupants of those shacks. Those old buildings are an eyesore. The whole program covering that land has been laid out, and it should be carried out as a whole and not piecemeal. I think it would be cheaper for the Government of the United States to do the work as a whole rather than to divide it up and take one part and work on it and then another part.

I sincerely hope the Senate of the United States will not take any action whereby the time for the removal of the remaining shacks will be extended.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The question has been asked by several Senators whether, under the order to remove the buildings, they will be taken down or whether they will continue to be occupied.

Mr. SMOOT. We intend to take them down when it is necessary. That does not mean that they will be torn down tomorrow, but when it becomes necessary we are going to demolish them. We want to give those who are living in the buildings time to arrange for other places to go.

Senators will remember that this matter has been in contemplation for years and years. A time will come when the buildings must be removed, and it seems to me the time has arrived and that we should make that improvement all at once, rather than piecemeal.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. DILL. I am concerned about whether or not the buildings are really going to be torn down, or whether these women are merely going to be turned out of them and then the buildings used for National Guard purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. The only reason why that building was used at the time for that purpose is because we compelled the National Guard to get out of the basement of Poli's Theater Build-

ing. There was no other place for them. The District of Columbia took the position and the National Guard took the position that it was a national activity and therefore the Federal Government had to provide for them. I appealed to the Attorney General for an opinion. The Attorney General stated just exactly as I knew he would state, that it was not a Federal Government activity and therefore the District of Columbia had to look after the National Guard, just the same as our own States look after their National Guard.

Mr. DILL. My point is not that I am objecting to the National Guard having a place to drill, but the objection I make is to compelling the women to leave the buildings and then allowing the buildings to remain standing. If the buildings are to stand, then I think the women ought to be permitted to occupy them. If we are not going to tear the buildings down, then we ought not to have made the appropriation for that purpose. If we are going to take them down, then let us take them down. They are a disgrace to the community.

Mr. SMOOT. The program calls for tearing them down, and I hope the program will be carried out.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] that if the buildings are going to be permitted to stand we might as well permit them to be used; but it certainly seems to some of us that the time has come, in fact the time long ago arrived, when those buildings should be demolished and the Plaza put in proper condition.

My immediate interest in the matter arises from the fact that I happen to be by appointment a member of the commission on the George Washington memorial celebration, which celebration takes place in 1932. Certainly every vestige of these shoddy buildings should be gotten rid of by that time.

People from all over the country, and very likely from all over the world will be visiting Washington then, and the city ought to be presented in its most beautiful garb and not have one of its principal parks marred by the presence of these miserable huts. They ought to have been torn down long ago. I think the Senate ought to order their destruction immediately.

Mr. COPELAND obtained the floor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I understand the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has withdrawn his objection to making Senate bill 3060 a special order for next Tuesday with the other two bills which have already been made a special order.

Mr. JONES. I hope the Senator will not submit that request now. One of the Senators who is absent for a short time asked me, if the matter came up, to object to the request. He asked whether I was going to object, and I told him under the circumstances I was not going to do so. Then he said, "I want you to object for me." I would rather the Senator would withhold his request a little while.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to suggest since we are going to adjourn over until Monday that it is very important that we should get the Harris immigration bill out of the way. I would not want to make some other measure the unfinished business unless we are certainly going to pass the immigration bill on Monday. I would be willing for the Senator to ask to have it made the unfinished business following the disposition of the immigration bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Making it a special order would not interfere with the unfinished business. Under the rule it would not come up until the unfinished business was disposed of.

Mr. JONES. I ask the Senator from New York to defer his request.

Mr. WAGNER. Does the Senator from Washington expect the particular Senator who desires to object to return to the Senate Chamber to-day?

Mr. JONES. Yes; he said he would be gone only a little while.

Mr. WAGNER. Very well.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to vote intelligently on this question. I am sorry I was not here when the early part of the debate occurred. How many persons are housed in these buildings?

Mr. JONES. About 500 or 550.

Mr. BLAINE. The testimony shows 550. A report made in connection with the testimony shows 600, but I assume it is between 550 and 600 women.

Mr. COPELAND. How soon would these women be asked to vacate the property if we proceed as the Senator from Wisconsin desires?

Mr. BLAINE. If my amendment is not agreed to, they will be required to vacate next July 1, about two months from now.

Mr. COPELAND. There never has been any doubt in the minds of those good persons over there that their abode was a temporary one, I assume, and they must have anticipated that the buildings would be vacated. I am in the greatest sympathy with all those who live there. I know how difficult it will be for them to move, and probably there are sentimental reasons why they would like to stay in those old war buildings, but of necessity they must know that this act on the part of Congress was contemplated. I know that I voted years ago in favor of the plan. The plan was presented to us by the then Senator from Maine, Mr. Fernald, and at that time Congress took action looking to the vacating of this property. There must come a time when we reach the dead line. In view of what the Senator from Utah and others have said about the approaching Washington celebration, I fear that, unhappily as it may seem for us to do this thing, the time has come, apparently, when we must determine upon this action.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] is chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I do not recall who are the other members. I believe the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is a member of that committee. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] are likewise members. I notice these Senators in the Chamber. I want to submit to the members of that committee who are present that there is a bill pending before their committee providing for a housing corporation, a cooperative plan under public authority, whereby Government women employees will have the opportunity to have a proper housing institution erected merely by the Government advancing the money, and under that plan the organization proposed by the bill will repay the principal with interest.

I would like to inquire of some member of the committee if the committee will take up that bill for an early hearing and report it out, whichever way the committee decides to report it, favorably or unfavorably, but at least get a report on it so the matter can be debated and considered by the Senate at a very early date. It does not involve a great deal of argument. It is a very simple matter. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to present the facts in a very few minutes before the committee if they desire to hear me and will then report the bill out in some form.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, not assuming to answer the question for my colleague [Mr. SWANSON] or any member of the committee, I want to inquire of the Senator if it is not a fact that quite a large number of the employees have anticipated such an enterprise and for that very purpose have already erected a building, which is completed or soon will be completed, just opposite the Grace Dodge Hotel?

Mr. BLAINE. We have been investigating the question of apartment houses in the city of Washington. I do not want to bring special condemnation upon any particular building. I am not going to discuss that now. But I am sure if I were to inform the Senator of the financial manipulations that have been going on in the District of Columbia he would at once be convinced that they are purely private schemes to get a few shekels from Government employees instead of being real, genuine cooperative buildings.

Mr. GLASS. I will state to the Senator that I know, as he knows, a great deal about financial manipulations of building enterprises in this city. I did not know any of it applied to this particular building. I know, in fact, nothing about it except that I have seen the building there.

Mr. BLAINE. I do not want to discuss that particular building, and I am not going to do so now.

Mr. GLASS. My only point is that we have to-day the same reasons that have almost interminably been presented for the destruction of this eyesore in this particular part of Washington City. It is a thing seen by every visitor to the city. It has seemed to me that it certainly ought to be removed immediately.

Mr. BLAINE. I know there is no real legitimate cooperative undertaking in the District for Government employees. I would like to have an expression of opinion from the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] or the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who are on the committee, as to the prospect for having an early hearing upon the bill to which I have referred, with a view of having it reported out, either favorably or unfavorably, so it may be given consideration. I ask for an expression of opinion on the part of the members of that committee who are present.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the matter has been presented from different sources by different Members. I look upon the general proposal with considerable favor, but I have not examined at all the particular proposal the Senator mentions.

Mr. BLAINE. I was not asking the Senator to give his approval of it. I was merely asking if the Senator would favor an early hearing upon the bill and have it reported out in some form.

Mr. FESS. Personally, I should be very glad to have it done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE]. The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] was necessarily called away. He has an amendment which he would like to have presented to the bill, and for him I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington in behalf of the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,000,000" and the word "to" and to insert "\$2,000,000; for the rebuilding and repairing of schoolhouses damaged or destroyed by the hurricane in the small towns and rural districts of Porto Rico, and for the employment of labor and the purchase of supplies, materials, and equipment for repairing and constructing insular and rural municipal roads, \$2,000,000; in all, \$4,000,000, of which \$3,000,000 shall become available upon the approval of this act, and the balance shall."

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, this amendment is pursuant to an estimate of the Budget Bureau. I know the attitude of the House conferees, but we shall do the very best we possibly can if the amendment is put on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. On behalf of the Senator from Connecticut I also offer another amendment, which I ask may be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 9, it is proposed to change the period to a comma and to add the words "and Public Resolution No. 33, approved January 22, 1930."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, adverting to the matter which I mentioned a while ago I have now received, duly classified, the items as to the printing expenses in connection with the George Washington bicentennial. They are as follows:

George Washington definitive writings; preparation of manuscript, \$11,525; printing and binding, \$25,000; preparation, printing, binding, and distribution of authorized pamphlets, \$17,000; preparation of and material for mailing portraits, \$7,000; preparation, printing, binding, and distribution of George Washington atlas and map, \$19,000; in all, \$79,525, to be immediately available.

I ask the chairman of the committee whether it would be a violation of the rule of his committee for him to accept the amendment at this time?

Mr. JONES. It would be contrary to the direction of the committee, and I should have to make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not estimated for and has not been reported by a standing committee. It can very well be taken care of in the next deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. FESS. When shall we have another deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. JONES. Probably within a month, anyway, if not earlier.

Mr. FESS. The Senator from Washington knows that the organization is now working under the leadership of Doctor Fitzpatrick and collecting material. Some expense is involved and there is no money available for the purpose. I hope we may have no difficulty in getting through an appropriation for this purpose very soon.

Mr. JONES. I think those interested should take this matter up with the Budget Bureau as soon as possible.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2719) granting the consent of Congress to the superintendent of public works of the State of New York to construct, main-

tain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River at the southerly extremity of the city of Troy.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6564) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

INVESTIGATION OF LEASES FOR POST-OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. BLAINE. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 244, providing for an investigation of leases for post-office buildings, which was submitted by me on the 8th instant, and is now on the table, be taken from the table and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not there is objection. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] is the Senator who previously objected, and he is not here. Will the Senator from Wisconsin wait until the Senator from Colorado shall have returned to the Chamber?

Mr. BLAINE. Is the Senator from Colorado in the city?

Mr. JONES. Yes; he has been on the floor to-day.

Mr. BLAINE. Then, I shall be very glad to renew my request later.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6564) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, and asking for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SMOOT, Mr. JONES, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. McKELLAR conferees on the part of the Senate.

RELIEF FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] now being in the Chamber, I renew my request that the bill introduced by me relating to employment exchanges and reported by the Committee on Commerce be made a special order, together with the other two bills which heretofore have been made a special order for April 15.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I regret very much to say to my good friend from New York, for whom I have the very highest regard, that, having read the bill and finding that it adds to Federal aid projects already under way and forces the States to expend money which they may not think it wise to expend, and being very much opposed to that kind of legislation, I hope the bill may be allowed to remain on the calendar for the present. Therefore, I am constrained to object.

Mr. WAGNER. May I say to the Senator that he must have read the bill rather hurriedly because there is no compulsion of any kind or character; the bill does not compel a State to make an appropriation, but action on the part of the State is entirely voluntary.

Mr. BINGHAM. Of course, the Government can not compel a State.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I should like to say just a word to the Senator from Connecticut in relation to this matter. Three bills, which were introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], have been reported favorably by that committee. The three form a particular series to accomplish a specific result. It is quite appropriate that they should be heard practically together. A special order has been accorded him by unanimous consent for two of the bills. The third one was held up merely as a matter of courtesy, to permit some persons to present information, which has been presented and printed in the Record.

Recognizing, of course, that the Senator's position is one that ought to be accorded the highest respect, will not the Senator consent that the third bill take the like course as the other two, because they all relate to the same subject and they ought to be disposed of as one specific matter?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I regret that I shall have to object at this time.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 51) to subject certain immigrants,

born in countries of the Western Hemisphere, to the quota under the immigration laws.

AMERICA FOR AMERICANS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long in my remarks to-day. I have already had something to say on this subject and will probably have something else to say before a vote shall be taken. I merely wish to speak now so that what I will say may appear in the same RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM].

For many, many years, Mr. President, the question of immigration has been a very serious and important one. For many years outside influences—foreign influences—have undertaken to direct congressional action on this question in the United States. They have through certain channels had to do with immigration measures which we were endeavoring to pass and finally did pass in other days. I have witnessed the defeat of measures on the immigration question since I have been in Congress because of those influences. When measures have been introduced looking to the restriction of immigration we have been told from time to time, just as the Senator from Connecticut told us yesterday and to-day, that we would offend our foreign friends if we were to impose restrictions against the coming of their people into the United States. Mr. President, the first duty I owe is to my country. "Be true to thyself" is a good motto, and it applies to nations as well as to individuals.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. In line with the statement of the Senator from Alabama let me say that I am a member of the Immigration Committee and attended all the hearings. Many people came from various sections of the country and protested against the immigration bill, but not one of them, as I recall—and I remember many and noted the fact at the time—urged that we pass a bill that would be for the best interests for the United States. Every one of those people, as the record will show, protested against the bill because it might discriminate or injure some other country. They did not, however, say a word about what would be best for our country.

Mr. HEFLIN. I thank the Senator from Georgia. He states the situation precisely.

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut occupies rather an amusing position. He has been pleading for our neighbors in South America. Of course, we want always to maintain amicable relations with them, but he has told us how we might offend them if we should decide that we wanted to establish a quota for various countries to the south of us. I did not hear him pleading for the millions of unemployed here at home, for the men who are walking the streets of the big cities, asking for something to do, for the men who hear their wives and children crying for something to eat.

Furthermore, following his address on yesterday, he offered an amendment, which was adopted, on the appropriation bill providing an appropriation to rebuild schoolhouses which had been blown down in Porto Rico. The Senator seems to have a long-distance affection for foreigners, and he comes to their rescue when anything happens to them.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope the Senator will not use the word "foreigners," when the appropriation to which he refers was entirely for the relief of American citizens.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand that, but they are outside of our immediate territory.

Mr. BINGHAM. They are outside of the State of Alabama, does the Senator mean?

Mr. HEFLIN. And outside of Connecticut, too.

Mr. President, I want charity to begin at home. I want to see every man who wants work in America to find work; I want every woman who wants work to have it; I want the hungry mouths of the people under that flag fed before I go off reaching into foreign countries, even into the possessions of the Government of the United States. Let us look after the old stock, those who are already here, who are good Americans. It is high time that we were getting back to the old American principle of protecting this country from all kinds of isms from abroad.

The Senator read copiously from various authorities upon this proposition. I want to read him a line or two from the Father of our Country. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, said:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.

Whenever we reach the point where we have got to decide who shall come to America, according to the whim and caprice of any foreign country, we have reached a dangerous stage of national degeneracy. The great mass of Americans will never take such a position as that. We can not afford to be governed in this matter by what foreign countries may think about it. Each country ought always to be free to say who shall come to dwell within its borders and who shall be kept out.

I want the countries south of us, if they desire to do so, to say that so many shall be permitted to go there from America. I am perfectly willing for them to do that. I am willing for Mexico to do that. I am not asking anything for the United States that I would withhold from foreigners on this question.

Now, let me read to the Senator what another President of the United States said upon the subject—James Madison, he who wrote the Constitution of the United States. Speaking upon this immigration question, he said:

What is the language of reason on this subject? That we should not be polite at the expense of prudence.

The Senator from Connecticut is very anxious that we shall be exceedingly kind and affable to our neighbors south of us; but Madison says that we must not forget our duty to our own country in an attempt to be pleasing to other countries.

Then I want to read from another one of the Presidents in the earlier days—John Adams. He said:

Why should we take the bread out of the mouths of our own children and give it to strangers?

That has the real American ring to it.

Then I read from the president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. William Green. He says:

During the past quarter of a century, the American Federation of Labor has advocated legislation to control immigration into the United States. We felt that such control was necessary in order to keep the United States a land of opportunity. To guard our gates we feel is necessary to the preservation of our national characteristics and to our physical and our mental health. In addition we believe immigration restriction is necessary to our economic progress. This labor believes is a constructive, practical view of one aspect of our population problem.

The fact that several European nations have passed under the rule of dictators for their own preservation in the last few years is enlightening. A republican form of government is the result of centuries of growth and of training in the exercise of self-restraint in political affairs. Its maintenance demands a high degree of intelligence. It can not be successfully adopted by a nation inexperienced in the exercise of rational liberty any more than the language of a people can be changed instantaneously.

Then, concluding, he said:

The political institutions of each given country are recorded in history, and in the long run are due to the self-development of the people of that country. Our republican institutions are the outgrowth of 10 centuries of the same people in England and America. They can only be preserved if the country contains at all times a great preponderance of those of British descent.

So the president of the American Federation of Labor is with us on this question.

Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence and the father of the great Democratic Party, said:

The mobs of great cities add just so much to the support of pure government as sores do to the strength of the human body. It is the manners and spirit of a people which preserve a republic in vigor. A degeneracy in these is a canker which soon eats to the heart of its laws and constitution.

I stand with Jefferson on this question and not with the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, I know that the concerns that make money out of this immigration traffic do not want this bill passed. I know that those who send their agents across the border line into Mexico, bringing in these peons, this cheap labor out of Mexico, bringing them over by the hundreds and thousands to take the places of American men and women, do not want this bill passed.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is rendering a great service in his effort to restrict this immigration, to place a quota at the door of Mexico and the countries south of us. There is no sound argument in the suggestion that we never

have done that. The situation years ago was not as serious as now. The necessity for action was not so great; but the necessity is here now.

What do we see? We see those who traffic in these Mexicans bringing over hundreds and thousands of them every year; and what are those Mexicans doing? They are not only working in the beet fields, they are not only working in the fruit orchards and vineyards, they are not only working on the railroads and in the American mines now, but they are working in some of the cotton factories of the country. Formerly we were told, "Why, they are just a handful of them and they just go and work in the beet fields, doing something that no white person will do." Now, however, they have come to be a serious problem in the United States.

I was up in Michigan—I called attention to that once before—coming into Detroit, and for miles and miles I saw Mexicans, nobody but Mexicans, working on the railroad, building and reconstructing railroad tracks. There was not a white man or an American negro in the group; nobody but this cheap Mexican labor. Do you tell me that Americans will not do that kind of work? It is not true. There are hundreds of thousands of men in Michigan who would be glad to do that work. They would be glad of a chance to do it. But what is the situation? Why, the people who are constructing those railroads can get that labor so much cheaper; and these Mexicans are a mixed breed, low-type, docile people. They can treat them almost any way; and what do they do to get them here?

They go down to the border line and bring these Mexicans in, pay their railroad fare and expenses to the point where they are going to work, and when they finish the work what do they do with them? Do they pay their way back and turn them over to the Government of Mexico? No; they leave them in the community where they did the work. They have no means with which to return, so they stay in the community or go into some other American community. They begin to wander around seeking jobs. Here is an American boy doing a certain kind of work, and a Mexican comes up and says, "I will do that for half what you are paying him."

And in too many instances he gets his job. That is what is going on in the country; and now since 1917 a million of them have come into the United States, and most of them have remained. Just think of that!

Mr. President, that presents a serious question, one that should give grave concern to every Senator who really loves his country. The population of Mexico is only 14,000,000. One-fourteenth of them, we are told, have come into this country inside of less than 15 years. That presents a serious problem. Are we going to do anything to keep them out? We certainly are. In spite of the appeal of the Senator from Connecticut, I expect to see the Senate pass this measure by a large vote. The toiling masses of America have rights; and if their friends in this body respond to their wants and to their needs they will vote for this bill, and we will put a stop to this sort of thing and send all Mexicans out of the country who did not come here under the laws of our country.

What kind of people are they? We are told that we ought not to act in haste in this matter; that it is a very serious matter; that we should take plenty of time to consider it. That is what they told us in 1920, when we had hearings on the immigration bill. They said the same thing again in 1926, and they said it again in 1928 on this very question, and here they are to-day, these everlasting postponers and delayers, asking us not to be in a hurry about it. The opponents of this measure now have the gall to wait until they can have a commission appointed to study the question and report to the Senate.

Mr. President, what is that for? That is for delay and maybe for the purpose of defeating this measure. I have already referred to a statement shown to me by Mr. J. H. Patten, of South Carolina, an able and excellent man, well informed upon this subject. He has fought for restricted immigration for 25 years, and has been very instrumental in helping to get the general immigration law that we have to-day. He showed me a statement sent out by the United States Chamber of Commerce to the effect that there would be no legislation on this subject at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I wonder how that chamber of commerce man got hold of that information, or misinformation. I think he is mistaken. I think we will have legislation upon this subject at this session of Congress. The interest of the American farmer and the American laboring man and the interest of the whole people demand that we pass this legislation at this session of Congress.

Who are these Mexicans peons being brought into our country? Here is the way they were referred to in the hearings in the House. The hearings were on temporary admission of illiterate Mexican laborers.

This was in 1920; and still they want more time in which to investigate and in which to report to the Senate!

A Mr. Roberts, from Texas, I think, was testifying. Speaking about the matter of bringing these people over, Mr. Welty, then a Congressman from Ohio, said:

I understand these concessions are granted by the Mexican Government?

Mr. ROBERTS. To individuals to make money out of the proposition.

Listen:

They are his cattle. He does not call them human beings.

"Cattle"—such a low type of human beings, the lowest kind of the peon type—among the very cheapest labor on earth. They refer to them as cattle; and we are bringing them in, thousands and thousands each year, using them for a time, and leaving them stranded in the community. They are not confined now to Texas; they are not confined to California, to New Mexico, and Arizona, the border States. We had a map before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the other day which showed that they had gone into all the 48 States but 6. They are being slipped in here and yonder and carried into the various States and they are leaving them there; and what else is suggested in this hearing in the House committee?

Many of them are diseased. Some of them almost reach the point of starvation. They become a charge upon the American community. They are put into American hospitals, and they are a dead expense to our people; and we are giving substance to take care of them that should be spent upon deserving American men and women who have been made sick because they could not get food and because the Mexicans get the work that should go to them.

Mr. President, I do not see how any American Senator can vote against the measure of the Senator from Georgia.

Let me just bring to the attention of the Senate another thing. Assistant Secretary of Labor White, testifying before the House Immigration Committee on January 5, 1928, stated, in effect, that the department makes no attempt to apprehend deportable aliens. Do Senators get the significance of that? They make no attempt to apprehend deportable aliens, these Mexicans who are here, left in the community where they were carried to work, left with no possible means of support, becoming a charge upon the community, taken in and given seasonal employment which Americans are entitled to have. Such a man has no business here.

The law has not permitted him to come here, so he is here in violation of the law. Yet this Assistant Secretary testifies that they make no effort to pick them up and send them back.

Is it not high time we were legislating on the subject? The argument in favor of this legislation is simply unanswerable. The department, Mr. White said, made no attempt to apprehend deportable aliens, but contented itself "with handling such cases as are forced upon it, and these come almost entirely from State institutions."

Still the Senator from Connecticut bids us open wide the door to this class of foreigners and stand with smiling face as this serious problem becomes more harmful and dangerous year by year in the United States. I would that I could arouse his sympathy for these millions of unemployed Americans in his own country. Let us be just to them before we are generous to foreigners.

Mr. President, just recently up in the city of Detroit it has been discovered that the city government had 1,500 aliens on the pay roll, while thousands of American citizens walked the streets of Detroit half clad and hungry. Again I say to the Senator from Connecticut, let charity begin at home. Assistant Secretary White said that the department could not do more than it was doing because there was a lack of certain machinery in the law, a lack of personnel necessary to apprehend, and a lack of appropriation for deportation. If that has not been corrected, I will vote for every dollar necessary to give them the needed equipment to do this work. We must and we will put a stop to the deplorable condition that we now have with regard to peon labor from Mexico. Mr. President, I know there are some people who have been relying on Mexican labor, and they say they do not see how they can get along without it. But I know, and everyone who hears me knows, that if we shut this Mexican labor out, they will have to get somebody to do the work, and when they are driven to that necessity they will find Americans who will do this work and be glad to do it.

You can not tell me that the millions in this country now unemployed, eager and anxious to find something in order to feed their wives and children and themselves, would stand with folded arms and be indifferent to an invitation to go out and gather fruit in orchards or grapes in vineyards or to pull the grass and weeds from the beet fields. They can find them. They must find them. This is the greatest Government on

earth, with the finest people in all the world. In order to keep it such a Government and such a people, we have to weed out certain degrading and undesirable elements that have been coming in here and spreading their poison in the body politic of America. O Mr. President, what a terrible situation we have now in many places. In our big cities there are organized racketeers, composed mainly of foreigners, in our midst. They are organized into lawless and murderous bands. They have arms of nearly every kind and are equipped with machine guns. And what do they do? They go to our merchants, large and small, and say to them, "Would you like to have this place broken into and robbed from time to time? Would you like to have your show windows broken and your property taken?" "Oh, no." "Well, you pay me \$100 or \$200 a month or more, and I will see that you are not disturbed."

My God! Think of such a thing as that, in this great country of ours. A band, an army of organized racketeers terrorize and hold the merchants of Chicago and other large cities in dread and fear, and rob them monthly, take so much from them to protect their property from themselves, the burglars and the robbers. That is the result of the coming in of criminal foreigners. They should be, and they must be deported. Pass my resolution on this subject and we will be rid of them.

Added to this problem of the unemployed there are 7,000,000 aliens who have never sworn allegiance to our flag, who have never taken out naturalization papers. Still some people go on placidly, like the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], bowing and smiling, asking that we do nothing, not even let foreign countries see us looking serious when we discuss the immigration question.

I know what my duty is. I took an oath when I came into this body that I would protect my own country against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, and I am going to be true to my oath?

The suggestion that some foreign country will be offended with the United States if we insist on doing what we think we should do on the immigration question has no terrors for me. I shall not hesitate to do what I feel that I should do to promote the security, the well-being, and happiness of the people here at home. Let the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] preach his foreign philosophy to his heart's content. It is not my philosophy, it is not the philosophy of my country, and I have but little patience with it.

If we ever weaken or waver on the question of our absolute right to do what we deem best regarding immigration to the United States, we are undone as a nation—we are lost.

The right and power, undisturbed by any foreign influence, to do what we feel is best for our country regarding immigration constitute the thing necessary to preserve free government in America.

Mr. President, some of these foreigners, whose names you would have difficulty in pronouncing, have resorted to kidnaping for a livelihood. They go and steal some innocent child, some little American boy or girl playing around home, seize it and carry it away into the woods or somewhere and hold it for days and weeks for ransom in this free country of ours. Father and mother frantic, terrorized, grief stricken, and crazed that such a thing could happen to any offspring of an American home.

Mr. President, the day will come, and conditions are nearly ripe for that day now, when somebody will lead the American people back to the mountain top of old-time American principles, where there will be no question about where real Americans stand on all questions that affect constitutional government in America. Then we may shut out all immigrants for a time. I would like to vote for a bill to cut out all immigration for five years, until we could take stock, as I have said before, and see who is who in the United States. There are a lot of things about this question that we need to know in the United States. We know that we have a large army of the unemployed and we are adding to it. We are not increasing the comforts and the happiness of our people. The situation that I complain about is adding to their distress.

On the border line Mexicans, a sorry type of cheap peons, are trooping over by the thousands and tens of thousands and they are coming in competition with the cotton producers of the South. The Anglo-Saxons of my State, as fine people as ever drew the breath of life, cotton producers of Alabama and of Georgia and of the other Southern States, are now forced into competition with this low-grade, cheap, dirty, peon labor of Mexico. That Mexican labor comes across the line and helps to produce the cotton crop in Texas, Arizona, and Oklahoma. They constitute a serious menace and danger to the cotton producers of the South. And I know that the Senator from Georgia feels just as I do about this question and I am sure that he will not accept any amendment permitting seasonal labor to come over into the cotton-producing area of the United States. If we

should grant them permission to come, thousands and tens of thousands will come across the border line and produce cotton in abundance in Texas and Oklahoma in competition with the producers of my State and the other great cotton-producing States of the Cotton Belt.

The cotton industry in the South is as old as the Government. The fact is we produced cotton before the Government was born, and now it has been suggested that cotton can be produced out in Texas cheaper than it can be produced in Alabama and Georgia and other Southern States, and that therefore we should cease producing cotton because it can be produced cheaper in Texas. Mr. President, just think of that miserable suggestion that would put thousands of people of my State out of employment, depriving the white men and women in the State of Alabama and in other Southern States of their means of livelihood in order to give employment to this cheap labor of Mexico. We should and we will put an end to this evil in our country.

That is the problem that confronts us. I do not believe any Senator here from the South will vote against this bill, and I expect to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I want to commend him for what he said on the subject, and that was that whether his amendment were adopted or not, he was going to vote for the Harris bill. So I think we are going to have a large majority of votes in this body in favor of that bill.

It is good for America to restrict immigration. It is good for the laboring man; it is good for his family; it is good for society. We do not want undesirable people coming in and mixing and mingling and being swallowed up in the body of American society. We think it is best from that standpoint to exclude them. We want to hold fast to our American principles and our American ideals and institutions.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I had intended to address the Senate to-day on the subject of Mexican immigration. I am glad, however, to give way to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I should like to give notice that on Monday, immediately after the unfinished business is taken up, I shall address the Senate on the subject.

CLAUDIUS H. HUSTON AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN THE SOUTH

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial from the Chicago Tribune in relation to the chairman of the Republican National Committee and political conditions in the South and ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Idaho in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

THE SOUTH IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The usefulness of Claudius H. Huston, of Tennessee, as chairman of the Republican National Committee seems to be more than in question. He explains and defends his connection with the Muscle Shoals promotion and with money collections to secure acceptance of the American Cyanamid Co. bid, a fund at one time used to cover his stock margins, it appears, but the Republicans do not care to enter the congressional elections with him in charge.

Mr. Huston is an exhibit of the new Republican endeavor to break further into the Democratic South, to keep what Mr. Hoover took from Al Smith, and to extend possessions further. It has not been executed with many fortunate results for the party. In trying to make the Democratic South Republican the management is making the Republican North Democratic. The control of the party is being turned over to the worst section of its hereditary enemies.

Mr. Hoover's strength in the South was not and is not and can not be new strength in the Republican Party. He did not get the new South, where industrial development might produce voters with the Republican point of view. He got the backward South, the clergy-ruled fundamentalists. He got votes inspired by intolerance. There weren't any political principles involved in the switch-over from the Democratic to the Republican column in the South. There was a great deal of bigotry. There was considerable hitch for profit and plunder. The sale of Federal offices already was making a scandal. Some of the turncoats hoped to make it a bigger one. Mr. Hoover is annoyed by that situation now.

Political clerics such as Bishop Cannon traded southern Democratic voters for control in the Republican national management. Their price was to be the dictation of policies obnoxious to many of the great Republican States. They used bidable and inflammable southerners to get a commanding position in the councils of a party which has had no use for their kind. When the Republican Party is itself its enemy for these ideas and the people governed by them is instinctive.

The spirit of the fugitive slave act was injected into the management of the party which detested it. The Republican Party was spread in the South by discarding its own best and taking over the Democratic worst. It was and is political degeneration. Southern Democrats of principle were not beguiled by it. It got the Cannons and Heffins. It would have been one thing to have taken the election and called it

a day, but that was not the program at all. The administration has tried to keep these offensive elements in the party, and, of course, can do so only by submission to their requirements.

It would seem that the purpose was to take the bigotry and illiteracy of the North and call it a party. It may be in the book that the American people must divide politically along that line before they can decide the questions of constitutional government, social control, and individual rights. If that is to be the case, one may be certain that the party of bigotry and illiteracy will not win. If the Republican Party takes to this road, it is on the way to the cemetery to join the other American parties which have supported oppression or compromised with its supporters.

It would be a desirable thing to break down the solidity of the South in political action, but to be desirable it requires another fashion of doing. It must come through honest differences of political opinion bringing decent citizens to support opposing candidates and ideas.

FLATHEAD POWER SITES IN MONTANA

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening last Mr. Benjamin C. Marsh, who describes himself as a lobbyist, gave to the press a statement in relation to what has come to be known as the Flathead power sites in the State of Montana. I ask that the statement be read from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS ABOUT FLATHEAD POWER SITES AND MONTANA POWER CO.

Benjamin C. Marsh, secretary of the Peoples' Lobby, who had been subpoenaed, told the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs to-day that Senator THOMAS J. WALSH, of Montana, by threatening to oppose a Senate resolution Mr. Marsh sought to have introduced expressing the opposition of the Senate to granting any permit or license to develop the Flathead power sites in Montana till the facts about the Power Commission had been brought out by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, had acted as a lobbyist for the Montana Power Co. would have acted.

Mr. Marsh said in part:

"In January this year I drafted a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal Power Commission should not do anything to further granting a permit or license for development of the Flathead power sites in Montana until the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce had finished investigating the executive secretary of the Power Commission. I didn't ask either Montana Senator to introduce it, because I feared the Montana Power and the Anaconda Copper Cos. would try to get them. However, I showed it to Senator WALSH of Montana, and to my surprise he said he would oppose this resolution on the floor of the Senate because the Indians were anxious to get some money out of the power sites they own there. I intimated that the Montana Power Co. was equally anxious to get them, and told Senator WALSH I should fight him if he opposed it. In 1922 I campaigned across the State of Montana for Mr. WHEELER in the primary and the election for United States Senator to help deliver the State of Montana from the strangle hold of the Montana Power Co. and the Anaconda Copper Co. I asked several Senators to introduce this resolution, but without exception when I told them of Senator WALSH's statement they declined to introduce it.

"I asked Senator COUZENS to do so as chairman of the committee investigating the Power Commission after he had made his statement at a committee hearing about its being one of the rottenest messes in government he had known, but he refused.

"I asked him how he could logically sanction the granting of a license by a commission where conditions such as he described obtained. He said Congress shouldn't create commissions to do something and then interfere with them. I told him anyone who took that position was particeps criminis in the wrongdoing of such commission. Mr. J. Henry Scattergood, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, also urged me not to press for the introduction of this resolution and tried to have me called off, I am informed.

"I am not charging venality on the part of Senators nor other Government officials, but abject cowardice and complete lack of guts in fighting the terroristic power combine, represented in Montana by the Montana Power Co. and the Anaconda Copper Co.

"The dishonest set-up of the Montana Power Co. in its application for the license for the development of the Flathead power sites is adequately revealing."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, this statement was given to the members of the press with the information that it would be presented at a meeting of the Indian Affairs Committee on the next morning, yesterday. At the same time there was given to the press what is generally known as a press release in relation to this statement, which doubtless will have appeared in a portion of the press of the country. I ask that it be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

(Released for mornings papers, Thursday)

Charging that "the Montana Power Co., really a subsidiary of the Electric Bond & Share Co., apparently got to the War Department engineers, who are detailed to the Federal Water Power Commission on the Flathead power set-up," Benjamin C. Marsh, executive secretary of the People's Lobby, in an address last night to the Liberal Club of George Washington University, asserted that "the Federal Power Commission has degenerated into such a tool of thieving power companies as a self-respecting Congress would promptly end."

Mr. Marsh said, in part:

"The Montana Power Co. is largely controlled by the Electric Bond & Share Co., which has defied the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to examine its books. John D. Ryan controls the Montana Power Co. and the Anaconda Copper Co.

"The Federal Power Commission obviously to help out the Montana Power Co., drew up a rental scheme of glaring falsehoods. It inflated the capital investment, and more than doubled the estimated transmission losses and incorporated the hoax that a dummy corporation, the Rocky Mountain Power Co., would sell below cost, without explaining that this sale below cost was a washout sale to its owner, the Montana Power Co. That was the rental plan of the Army Engineers, who are the engineers of the Federal Power Commission. When this plan was exposed the Power Commission put forward another set-up, which is just as big a fraud."

"The People's Lobby," Mr. Marsh said, "will endeavor to get Congress to adopt a resolution opposing the granting of any permit to develop the Flathead power sites, until the Couzens bill, amending the Power Commission act becomes a law. If Congress fails to do this, it assumes the rôle of receiver of stolen goods," Mr. Marsh said.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, Mr. Marsh did not, as he said he would, present this statement to the Committee on Indian Affairs on yesterday, but he did as a matter of fact appear before that committee and he testified substantially as is set forth in the statement. That it is a contempt of the Senate I entertain no doubt.

However, I have no disposition whatever to treat it as such. I take note of the threat of Mr. Marsh that because I indicated an opposition to a resolution which he desired to have some one present in the Senate and urge its passage, he would oppose my reelection. Well, I shall endeavor to bear with what fortitude I can any attack which may be made upon me by Mr. Marsh. I bear no resentment even toward him for his attitude in the matter. I am sure that the declaration on his part was the ebullition of the moment, and that it was made without reflection. I am sure that his conclusion upon further thought upon the matter will be that he probably would not improve the situation very much from his point of view by substituting some one else for the two Senators who now represent the State of Montana in this Chamber.

I note, however, Mr. President, that Mr. Marsh takes the position that the attitude of the two Senators from Montana with respect to his resolution and with respect to the whole matter is because of some dominant position which the Montana Power Co. and the Anaconda Copper Co. have in the politics in the State of Montana. It is a part of the history of our State, well known to most public men, that neither my colleague nor myself is here by the grace of the Anaconda Copper Co., and that neither of us would be here if it had its way about matters in our State. I say this likewise without any purpose to reflect upon the attitude of either the Anaconda Copper Co. or the Montana Power Co. Their opposition to me is an affair of nearly 20 years ago and I apprehend that the asperities of those days have very largely passed away. As is said by Mr. Marsh in the article, the fight which I have made in this body in order to have the public more accurately and fully apprised concerning the affairs and business of the power companies in the United States will make it unnecessary for me to justify my attitude in that regard.

However, Mr. President, because so much has been said regarding the matter about the corridors of the Senate and the press I think it would not be inappropriate for me at this time to indicate why I was opposed to the resolution which Mr. Marsh was desirous of having considered by this body. It, in effect, provided that all action by the Federal Power Commission on applications for permits to develop the power sites on the Flathead River be suspended until an investigation should be had of charges made by one subordinate of the commission against another subordinate of the commission. It occurred to me that that was no reason whatever for deferring or delaying action by the commission itself.

I ought to say, Mr. President, that this is one of the great water powers of the country, comprising five sites in the State

of Montana on the Flathead River which empties into Flathead Lake, which is thus a great natural reservoir. The Flathead Lake is one of the largest bodies of fresh water between the Mississippi River and the Pacific Ocean. The five sites on the Flathead River are capable of the development of something over 200,000 horsepower. It thus ranks with one of the great water powers of the country. Even before I came to the Senate, Mr. President, I had taken a keen interest in the development of those sites. For more than 30 years the people of the State of Montana have looked forward to that great development with hope and expectation. The sites are situated within the Flathead Reservation in the State of Montana, and are, perhaps justly, regarded as one of the great assets of the Flathead Tribe.

The present condition of that tribe, Mr. President, is far from what their friends might reasonably hope it would be. Poverty and destitution are by no means lacking within the tribe. The best of the Indians on that reservation are not too well fixed in respect to this world's goods. Whatever may come from the development of these power sites will go to the benefit of those Indians, and very naturally they, and their friends likewise, have been hoping year after year for the development of these resources; and year after year they have been dragging along at the very edge of penury, if not entirely within that domain, waiting and hoping for something to be done to enable them to receive some benefit from this property of theirs. So, when I came to the Senate 17 years ago, one of the things with which I charged myself was the promotion of some legislation that would unlock the power sites of the country and permit their development, and particularly the development of the Flathead power sites.

I was accordingly, Mr. President, deeply interested and active in the enactment of legislation which culminated in the act of 1920. Shortly after the passage of that act, in the year 1921, the Rocky Mountain Power Co. filed application for a preliminary permit looking to the development of this power site, and two or three other companies likewise filed applications for preliminary permits, but no action was taken for several years thereafter, until I finally went to the executive secretary of the Power Commission, Mr. Merrill, on several occasions, and insisted that he put before the commission these applications and ask for action upon them; in other words, Mr. President, during the entire time of my 17 years' service in the Senate I have had this matter on my mind and have been active in endeavoring to get this development under way.

Finally, in 1927, the Rocky Mountain Power Co., a subsidiary of the Montana Power Co., which is now a subsidiary of the American Power & Light Co., which is a subsidiary of the Electric Bond & Share Co., made an application for a license to develop one of these sites; perhaps not at all unlikely the most eligible of the five, capable of producing primary horsepower to the extent of from 68,000 to 70,000 horsepower. We understood some time ago that it was capable of producing 100,000 horsepower, but that figure appears by later information to have been somewhat reduced. Shortly thereafter, however, applications for a preliminary permit covering all five sites was filed by an engineer of the city of Minneapolis, Mr. Walter H. Wheeler.

In the year 1927, Mr. President, I made a speech on the Flathead Indian Reservation, at Polson, upon this general subject. At that time, as my recollection now serves me, Mr. Wheeler's application had not been filed. The question then at issue was whether development should be undertaken by private parties under the operation of the act of 1920 or, as suggested in some quarters, it should be carried on by the Government itself.

I ought to say in this connection, Mr. President, that in the year 1926 the House of Representatives, apparently despairing of any development under the act of 1920, and being desirous of making some use of the power for the purpose of pumping water for the irrigation project on the reservation, made provision for a small development of 7,500 horsepower by the Government. If that work were to go on—indeed, I might say it was projected quite a number of years ago by the Reclamation Service and subsequently abandoned for many years and revived in the year 1926—if it were to go on, it would entirely arrest the development in a large way of these power sites, or if the development in a large way should proceed the smaller development by the Government would be entirely inundated. In order to carry on the large development it would be necessary to pay the cost of the small development, which would be utterly destroyed. That situation being represented to the Congress, the provision of the act of 1926 was repealed in 1928, the discussion on the floor here having been quite generally participated in. So that legislation being out of the way, finally it looked as if there was going to be development of these power sites.

There was then the application of the Montana Power Co. for a license to develop the one power site and the application for a preliminary permit by Mr. Wheeler for all five sites; that is to say, Mr. Wheeler desired to get a permit to carry on explorations for three years, in order to determine for himself whether he would care to enter into an agreement for the development of any or all these sites.

Considerable testimony was taken by the Power Commission with respect to this matter. However, before I discuss that phase of the question I wish to refer for a moment to an address which I made upon this subject in 1927. At that time I said:

If we were going to have this power developed by private enterprise I would like to see that permit go to some other company than the Montana Power Co. I have nothing against the Montana Power Co.; they have done a lot to develop the country; but I would like to see some other company come into this State and divide up the business with it. I am old-fashioned enough to believe that competition is the life of trade. But there doesn't seem to be any other company looking for it. I think that probably the friendly relations existing between great organizations carrying on such work make them regard this as Montana Power Co. territory.

I thought possibly that the Byllesby Co. might want to come in and contend for the permit. The J. G. White Co. owns the light and railway system in Helena; they engage in such interests. Stone & Webster have great interests of this kind in Seattle; they built the first dam across the Missouri River at Canyon Ferry. But none of them are asking for the permit.

So, Mr. President, the situation was this, that none of the great companies, with the necessary financial support, have made any application whatever under the act of 1920 as against the Montana Power Co. or its subsidiary, the Rocky Mountain Power Co. The only other contender was Mr. Wheeler. At my earnest solicitation, addressed to the secretary of the Power Commission, he informed me, as I understood, that there would be a hearing of the rival applications before the Power Commission, and, much to my surprise, I was advised that instead of the hearing to take place before the Power Commission it was to take place before the secretary himself, Mr. Bonner, the testimony thus taken afterwards to be reviewed as in the nature of an appeal by the commission. Likewise I understood from the talk I had with Mr. Bonner, the secretary, that there would be an open hearing, with an opportunity for every applicant to present whatever case he had and to make whatever case he could against his antagonists. Much to my surprise my attention was called to a notice given out by Mr. Bonner which seems to be entirely inconsistent with that idea. That notice is as follows:

NOTICE OF HEARING

Notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held before the executive secretary of the Federal Power Commission in room 2335, Interior Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m., Monday, October 28, 1929, under authority of the Federal water power act (41 Stat. 1063), in the matter of the pending applications of Rocky Mountain Power Co. (No. 5) and Walter H. Wheeler (No. 868), contemplating hydroelectric developments affecting Flathead Lake and Flathead River, Mont.

The purposes of this hearing are to afford Walter H. Wheeler opportunity to present evidence in support of his petition for reconsideration of the tentative decision of the executive secretary to recommend to the commission that his application be denied; to afford opportunity to other parties who may be affected by the power development proposed by Mr. Wheeler or by the Rocky Mountain Power Co. to present their views; to permit the public expression of views relating to interest of the tribal Indians and of the mission irrigation project in the proposed developments; and to allow full and frank discussion of other matters pertinent to the present power projects which involve Flathead Lake and Flathead River.

All interested parties are invited to be present or to be represented at the above time and place.

Except for briefs and oral arguments submitted in accordance with Section IV of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Commission, dated May 1, 1929, the hearing will be confined to the presentation of oral or documentary evidence respecting pertinent facts of which the witnesses have personal or expert knowledge.

F. E. BONNER, *Executive Secretary.*

SEPTEMBER 10, 1929.

Upon receipt of that communication, I addressed a letter to Mr. Bonner indicating that it did not by any means conform to my understanding of what was to take place.

I addressed him, accordingly, and had from him in reply a letter under date of October 25, 1929, as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, October 25, 1929.

Hon. T. J. WALSH,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: In reference to your letter of October 19 and our discussion Monday concerning the Flathead matter.

I am sorry, indeed, you received the impression that hearing in this case would be held before the commission itself. As Colonel Tyler and I explained to you Monday, the procedure followed is in accord with the established practice and procedure. Recognizing, however, that this case presents some very involved questions, the parties at interest will be given an opportunity to move for a hearing in the first instance before the commission if they so desire. I am advised that prior appointments will make it impossible, however, for all members of the commission to attend all sessions on this short notice.

Very truly yours,

F. E. BONNER, *Executive Secretary.*

I did not content myself, however, with the communication to the executive secretary; but I waited upon two of the members of the commission—the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of War then being ill, making it impossible for me to see him—and specifically and personally requested the members of the commission that the hearing be before the commission and not before the executive secretary. I addressed identical communications to them as well, that to the Secretary of the Interior being as follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1929.

Hon. RAY L. WILBUR,
Commissioner, Federal Power Commission.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: I am inclosing a copy of a letter I am this morning sending to the executive secretary of the Federal Power Commission, together with a copy of notice of hearings on the matter of award of a permit to develop what is known as the Flathead power site. You are perhaps not unaware that the site in question is one of the great power sites of the country, the development of which is much needed to meet the industrial wants of our State and adjacent territory.

May I have the assurance from you that the hearings contemplated will be before the commission and not before the executive secretary upon the issue as indicated in the notice?

Very respectfully yours,

T. J. WALSH.

The answer of the Secretary of the Interior to that is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, October 21, 1929.

Hon. T. J. WALSH,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Acknowledging your letter of October 19, together with the copy of one sent to the executive secretary of the Federal Power Commission, may I state that I will be glad to give the most careful attention to this important question. I realize this Flathead power site is one of the great power sites of the country and have every desire to do justice to all interests concerned.

While I may not be able to come to the preliminary hearing of which you speak, you can rest assured that before decision is made the whole question will be carefully reviewed by me as a member of the Federal Power Commission; also that I will be glad to hear any protests as to the findings of the executive officers of the Federal Power Commission.

Sincerely yours,

RAY LYMAN WILBUR.

I had a further communication from the executive assistant to the Secretary, of date October 25, 1929, which reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, October 25, 1929.

Hon. THOMAS J. WALSH,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Confirming my conversation Thursday afternoon with you regarding the Flathead power hearing, scheduled for Monday next, I have made the following suggestion to Mr. Bonner, executive secretary of the commission: When the hearing convenes before him the question of whether it is to continue before the executive secretary or before the full commission may be brought up by motion of Mr. Wheeler, the applicant, if he desires that course. If such motion is made, it should be explained to him that because of shortness of notice (dating from your communication of Wednesday) it will be impossible for the three commissioners to adjust their appointments so as to sit personally throughout the hearing, and it will therefore be necessary, if the motion is granted, that the commissioners be represented through a great part of the time by their assistants. Under

these circumstances Mr. Wheeler may prefer to have his case heard in regular course; that is, first before the executive secretary, with right of appeal to the commission. But if he prefers to adopt the special course, which you considered advisable in your communication to the commission, I know that the commissioners will do what they can to accommodate him.

Very truly yours,

NORTHCUTT ELY,
Executive Assistant to the Secretary.

When the hearing came on I appeared there, called attention to the communication thus addressed to the various Secretaries, and action was taken as indicated by the record of the hearing, from which I read, as follows.

At page 7:

Senator WALSH. Mr. Secretary, do you recall that I addressed a communication to you, and also to the members of the commission, asking that the hearing be had before the commission—the secretary, of course, sitting with them, with the aides in his office. I understood that a motion was to be made by one of the parties to that end. I suppose this will be the appropriate time for the consideration of that motion.

Secretary BONNER. It would, Senator WALSH, if there is such a motion to be presented.

Mr. FORBES (representing Mr. Wheeler). Mr. Chairman, the motion has already been presented and been, in part, answered by yourself as executive secretary.

I present a copy of my motion, a statement of facts in support of it, and Mr. Bonner's action upon it, and ask that it be made a part of the record.

Secretary BONNER. The documents may be made a part of the record. Would you care to read them into the record, Mr. Forbes?

Mr. FORBES. Yes, sir. [Reading:]

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 23, 1929.

To the FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION:

In the matter of the applications of Walter H. Wheeler (No. 868) and the Rocky Mountain Power Co. (No. 5).

Petition for joinder of public hearings on the aforesaid pending application.

Now comes Walter H. Wheeler, an applicant, before the Federal Power Commission for the issuance of a preliminary permit contemplating hydroelectric developments affecting Flathead Lake and Flathead River, Mont., and respectfully petitions the honorable the Federal Power Commission to hold joint public hearings on both the above-numbered applications, and it is further respectfully petitioned that the notice of hearing, dated September 10, 1929, issued by the executive secretary of the commission, be modified to the extent of placing both the said applicants in the same position at said hearing before the commission; that both of said applicants be served with formal notice of said joint hearing to be held at 10 a. m. on Monday, October 28, 1929.

A statement of fact in support of this petition is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

WALTER H. WHEELER, *Applicant.*
DANIEL R. FORBES, *Attorney.*

The statement of fact submitted at that time by Mr. Wheeler being rather lengthy, and not altogether relevant to the matter before us, I pass that. It having been read, however, Mr. McCormack, representing certain interests, arose and said:

If permissible, Mr. Chairman, I should like to join in that motion on behalf of the county of Flathead.

Then Mr. Kelly, representing the Rocky Mountain Power Co., said:

On behalf of the Rocky Mountain Power Co., I will join in that motion, and will be glad to participate in a hearing before the full commission, if that is agreeable.

Senator WALSH of Montana said:

Nothing that I have said here this morning, Mr. Secretary, or elsewhere, is to be construed into associating myself with any representations that may be made in the petitions that have just been read, or in the nature of a criticism of any action heretofore taken by any member of the force of the Federal Power Commission. Without any regard to those matters, I am very glad to note that all of these representatives unite in asking a hearing before the commission as a whole. It seems to me that, although the practice which is prescribed by the rules of a preliminary hearing before the executive secretary is, perhaps, entirely wise applied to applications generally, possibly for the development of 5,000 or 10,000 horsepower, where there is no real serious controversy about the matter, it should be borne in mind that this is one of the great water powers of the country; that there are sharply contesting claimants for the permit, and there is a great general interest in the subject, as is manifested by the appearances which have been made here this morning.

And those facts seem to me to set this application apart from the general run of applications.

And it was for these reasons that I suggested the hearing before the commission in the first instance, before the commission itself. I am not to be understood as otherwise joining in the application that has been read. I thought the commission and the members thereof ought to see the parties who testify, and themselves interrogate the witnesses, if it is deemed necessary or desirable on their part, for the purpose of fully informing themselves about the matter.

I also feel that no one need concern himself particularly in the proceeding before the commission, or before the executive secretary, on the question of where the burden of proof is. I think that any applicant will be borrowing trouble if he concerns himself with respect to that. I am perfectly certain that the commission will regard the matter as an open thing, to be heard upon such representations as each contending party may make with respect to the matter.

Secretary BONNER. Are there any other arguments on this motion?

Mr. GORUD (representing the Flathead Indians). I also join in the application.

Mr. DELLWO. And the Flathead irrigation district also joins in that.

Mr. HARBERT. Mr. Chairman, I join in that request.

Secretary BONNER. Is there anyone that has any objection to offer to the motion?

You will understand, gentlemen, that this question was raised only a few days ago by Senator WALSH's letter. And it is difficult to secure the attendance of the members of the commission on short notice, and if the motion is granted it will be on the understanding that the commission will participate only to the extent of their ability, but will endeavor to have one of their representatives sit in case of their being absent for a part of the time. Will there be any objection to it on that basis?

And there being none, that order was made and the hearing was thereafter had before the commission, the assistants to the Secretaries sitting when the Secretaries were unable themselves to be present.

Mr. President, at this point I desire to put in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Mr. Bonner. I read it, as follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1929.

Hon. F. E. BONNER,

Executive Secretary, Federal Power Commission.

MY DEAR MR. BONNER: My attention has just been called to the particular wording of the notice of hearing in relation to the Flathead power site issued by you under date of September 10, 1929. I am somewhat surprised at its language in view of the talk I had with you some days prior to the date of the notice, from which I gained the very distinct impression, and so notified many of my constituents, that the hearing would be before the commission and not before the executive secretary, as to the recommendation he should make to the commission in the premises. Furthermore, I understood that the hearing would be open and general and not in the nature of a hearing on the protest of Mr. Wheeler against the application of the Rocky Mountain Power Co. I certainly gathered the idea from our talk that Mr. Wheeler would be on exactly the same footing with respect to his application as the Rocky Mountain Power Co., and that the matter would not assume the attitude, as indicated by the notice, of a hearing on an application for a reconsideration of the decision already made by you.

I am deeply concerned about the speedy award of a permit under proper conditions and restrictions, but without any preference whatever as between rival applicants for it. I went to your office for the purpose of assuring myself that there would be a hearing on the subject by the commission and supposed I had assurance from you that such a hearing would be had.

In view of the present situation I am sending a copy of this letter to the members of the commission, with a copy of the notice issued by you. The matter seems to me of sufficient importance to call for an open hearing before the commission itself.

Very truly yours,

T. J. WALSH.

Mr. President, that being the situation of affairs, having labored, and having labored successfully, to take this hearing away from Mr. Bonner and have it before the commissioners themselves, as it was had before the commissioners themselves, I was unable to give any countenance to the resolution which Mr. Marsh desired to have presented to the Senate to suspend action because, forsooth, there was some kind of a quarrel between Mr. Bonner, the executive secretary, and Mr. Russell, one of the attorneys for the Power Commission, each indulging in charges against the other. That, and my eager desire to have this work go forward, was the reason, and the only reason, why I objected to Mr. Marsh's resolution, and signified to him that I should fight it if it came on the floor.

But, Mr. President, in this connection, Mr. Marsh's statement quotes a remark attributed to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COTZENS], made before the Committee on Interstate Commerce

when some testimony was being adduced with respect to this matter before that committee, to the effect that "this was the rottenest mess in government" that had come under his notice, evidently intending to carry the impression that this matter of the award of a permit for the development of the power sites on the Flathead was thus characterized by the Senator from Michigan.

The record discloses that when the Senator from Michigan made the remark thus attributed to him, he was referring to matters entirely disassociated with the award of a permit for the development of the Flathead power sites. The testimony will be found on pages 64 and 65 of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate Commerce, United States Senate, Seventy-first Congress, second session, pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 80, from which I read, as follows.

Mr. King, the auditor of the Power Commission, was testifying, and he said:

Mr. KING. In August or September, 1929, and we have had no particular difficulty, Senator, except that that was not served upon licensees in just the way it should have been served. You understand that we have first the investment in the original project, and then each year thereafter in some cases we have additions and betterments. It is just as important to have the details of cost of additions and betterments as of the original project. The executive secretary served that accounting bulletin on all licensees to which it was applicable and asked for an analysis of the costs of the original project as provided by the form or schedule. But so far as additions and betterments were concerned, he told them it would apply only to major additions and betterments. Now, I do not know what major additions and betterments mean. It is a term that is not defined, and is one which will create controversy over the meaning of it, and will permit, if his instructions are observed, the power companies to report in more or less lump sums without any analysis of additions and betterments to plants.

Senator WHEELER. That is the situation, then?

Mr. KING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had any occasion to look into the preliminary cost of the Cumberland River Power Co. project?

Mr. KING. Yes, sir; we did that rather carefully.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you found anything wrong with it?

Mr. KING. There were a number of items that were criticized and eliminated, or perhaps are to be eliminated, and that matter has been referred to the solicitor, and I think a couple of opinions issued upon certain items included in the preliminary cost statement.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to have a statement prepared by counsel calling for all these facts with respect to these major projects. We seem to be getting piecemeal information here about these different cases, but we have no complete statement of the major controversies. I think the task of getting that out is much overrated. I do not think we will have any trouble in getting the major cases.

Mr. KING. It can be done, Mr. Chairman, but will involve considerable work.

The CHAIRMAN. I should like to know also how much trouble it would be to find how much time has elapsed between the making of application for these licenses and the granting of them. I have understood that there has been intolerable delay in the matter of taking action. In other words, the whole set-up of the commission is so incomprehensible that it is one of the rottenest exhibitions of government I have ever heard of.

Senator WHEELER. Some of these applications have been pending for many years, have they not?

Mr. KING. I think so. I am not well enough informed to testify regarding that except in a general way. But I know that certain applications have been pending for years.

Those who know Mr. Marsh will, of course, very readily realize that what he really objects to in this matter is the development by private interests at all. He wants these power sites held up until at some time in the more or less distant future the Government of the United States shall enter upon the work of developing the power sites of the country.

That is an entirely different question from the question as to whether under certain particular conditions and circumstances the Government may not itself engage in power development as incidental to other work. For instance, in the case of the Salt River irrigation project in the State of Arizona, it became necessary to store water for the purposes of irrigation, and in the storage of the water it was convenient and economical to develop power, and the Government went on and developed power, and they are now disposing of that power at very satisfactory prices.

In the matter of the Muscle Shoals, with which we have been so lately concerned, the Government found it necessary to provide itself with an adequate supply of nitrates for use in time of war, and in order to do so it was deemed necessary to develop the power of Muscle Shoals.

Mr. President, we have had before use the development of the St. Lawrence River for navigation and power, the work to go on for both purposes.

The Government has developed power to a very large extent at the Sault Ste. Marie incidental to its work of improvement of the navigation of the channel between Lake Superior and the lower lake.

Many circumstances and conditions may arise in which one who would not think for a moment of having the Government engage generally in the development of power sites all over the country would be quite willing that under particular circumstances and under particular conditions the Government should undertake that work. But Mr. Marsh does not want any power development whatever to be carried on by private parties.

As stated in the address delivered by me as far back as 1927, if there were any reasonable probability of the Government of the United States taking hold of and developing this power itself, within any time we can look forward to, it would present itself in quite a different aspect. But I am not willing in the present state of the public mind with respect to the public development of power sites of the country to let this project lie idle until that sentiment is developed sufficiently to warrant the belief that the time is at hand when the Government will engage in such activities.

Mr. President, let us see what this signifies. According to information lately compiled by the Geological Survey, the United States has potential water-power resources aggregating, as a minimum, 38,110,000 horsepower; as a maximum, 59,166,000 horsepower. Of that there had been developed by January 1, 1928, approximately 12,000,000 horsepower, leaving a minimum of 26,000,000 and a maximum of 47,000,000 horsepower in the United States still undeveloped. If that horsepower can be developed at an average of even \$100 a horsepower, it means an investment by the Government of the United States in the one case of \$2,600,000,000 and in the other case of \$4,700,000,000. Of course, there would be all manner of contention from all parts of the country for appropriations by Congress for the development of power sites.

I undertake to say we are a generation at least away from any such policy, and accordingly I can see no reason for arresting this development to await such a radical change in public sentiment or in the policy of our Government.

I have a letter here from Mr. Norman Thomas, late Socialist candidate for President of the United States, with my reply to him, and I refer to his letter here because it expresses, to my mind, very much the same idea, very much the same thought, that has actuated Mr. Marsh in his activities in this matter. This letter is of date January 13, 1930, and reads as follows:

LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY (INC.),
New York City, January 30, 1930.

Senator THOMAS WALSH,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I am addressing this identical letter of inquiry on the Flathead power situation in your State to you and Senator WHEELER.

As I understand matters, the Federal Power Commission is about to grant to the Rocky Mountain Power Co., a dummy of the Montana Power Co., which, in turn, is associated with the Power Trust through its connections with the Electric Bond & Share Co., immensely valuable water-power rights on the Flathead River capable of generating more primary power than Muscle Shoals. I am further informed that in this grant the rights of the Flathead Indians are involved and that a more favorable offer for the power has been made to the Indians. Finally, I understand that the Montana Power Co. and the Anaconda Copper Co., with which the Montana Power Co. is closely identified, want this power less to use it themselves than to keep it out of use by their competitors.

But I do not write to argue the merits of one private application for this power as against another. I am committed, as I thought you were, by your own statements and the position of your presidential candidate in 1928, to public development of power, at least, on the remaining water-power sites, of which the Flathead sites are among the best. Even if you believe that President Hoover and a Republican majority in Congress will force some kind of lease I should think you would be obliged to oppose this lease at this time to the Montana Power Co. for the following reasons:

1. President Hoover himself is on record concerning the inadequacy of a power commission made up of busy Cabinet officers, who, I understand, were present less than half the time during the hearing on this case. There is absolutely no reason for haste which requires that this lease be made before a proper commission has been set up.

2. The secretary to the Power Commission is now under charges by reason of a resolution in the Senate alleging that he has disrupted the accounting system of the commission by farming out the work to two

separate governmental departments. While these charges are pending it is criminal that a commission of which he is the active officer should be giving a long lease on one of the Nation's great natural resources.

After the lease has been granted there will be nothing the Federal Government can do about rates. The State commission, I understand, is under the thumb of the Montana Power Co. The time to act is now, and the country has a right to look to you, not only because you are Senator from Montana but because you have been a leading progressive, to take some vigorous stand in the matter.

I write not only as a citizen but as executive director of the League for Industrial Democracy and chairman of the public affairs committee of the Socialist Party, both of which organizations are in different ways deeply interested in the matter. I am making my letter public, and assume that you will do the same with your reply.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN THOMAS.

To that I replied, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1930.

HON. NORMAN THOMAS,
League for Industrial Democracy,
112 East Nineteenth Street, New York.

MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: I am in receipt of your letter of January 30 in relation to the applications pending before the Federal Power Commission for a permit to develop the Polson power site.

Were the question before us one of the development of the power site by the public on the one hand or by private interests on the other, it is quite likely that I should be in favor of the development by the organized public; but you can not be unaware that that is not the question, but whether the site shall be developed by private interests or not developed at all; at least, not developed within any period that can now be estimated or forecast.

For 30 years of my residence in the State of Montana our people have looked with hope deferred on the utilization of this great natural resource for the upbuilding of our sparsely settled country. Now when the prospect of its development is at hand to be told that we must wait for an indefinite period, probably not less than a generation, until the General Government or the State enters upon the policy of power development naturally arouses no very sympathetic response. I should, as I stated publicly in an address in Montana, prefer to see some reliable company other than the Montana Power Co. get the permit, but I should rather see the Montana Power Co. get it than that it should longer lie idle.

You appear to be somewhat better informed than I am concerning what the commission will do with respect to the two rival applications now under consideration by it. I am entirely uninformed as to whether it will or will not grant the permit to the Montana Power Co. or to either of the applicants now seeking it.

You are quite accurately informed that the Montana Power Co. is closely related to the Anaconda Co.; indeed, to all intents and purposes the management of the two companies is identical, and you may be right that it has no purpose to make use of the power to be generated, but seeing that the enterprise involves an expenditure estimated at \$8,000,000, the cost of keeping the plant idle will not be inconsiderable. I prefer to believe that it will, from business reasons, be forced to find a profitable use for the power it produces.

You are correctly informed that the Indians are deeply interested in the development. Many of them are in a state bordering on penury, if not destitution. The royalty will be a godsend to them. Their interests are being very carefully looked after by Commissioner Rhoads and Assistant Commissioner Scattergood. The latter has, to my knowledge, been giving the most intensive study to the question and has made elaborate figures of the amount which the permittee ought to pay for the benefit of the Indians.

I note what you say about deferring action until charges pending against the executive secretary of the commission are disposed of, and your very expressive assertion that it would be criminal for the commission to act favorably upon either of the applications while the charges are pending against its secretary. I pass the implication that I would be participating in a crime in urging, as I am, reaching a speedy disposition.

You may not have been informed that in accordance with the alleged practice of the commission, the secretary directed that a hearing would take place before himself, the notice indicating that he had tentatively determined to award the permit to the subsidiary of the Montana Power Co. I went before the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of War being ill at the time and subsequently dying, and prayed that the hearing be had before the commission itself. This was done. Unfortunately, the members of the commission were unable to attend at all times, but in the absence of any of them an assistant sat in his stead. There is, accordingly, no reason for delaying proceedings to await an investigation of the executive secretary. Nor can I consent to delay to await a reorganization of the commission, not likely to be accomplished during this session of Congress, at least, in view of the tremendous volume of business before us.

I regret that we should differ about this matter, but my attitude is plainly stated above.

Very truly yours,

T. J. WALSH.

Mr. President, as indicated there is really only one application before the commission for the development of any of the power sites. That is the application of the Rocky Mountain Power Co. The other application, I repeat, is not an application to develop any of those sites, but is an application for a preliminary permit extending over a period of three years to make preliminary investigations in order to determine whether the applicant, Mr. Wheeler, will apply for a license to develop the five power sites or any of them.

It is not a secret at all that since the letter was written which has last been read the Power Commission, or at least the Secretary of the Interior, speaking for the commission, has been carrying on negotiations with the Montana Power Co. with a view to fixing the rate of royalty under which a license should be granted to that company. I speak of this because testimony to that effect was given before one of the committees of the Senate. It must be assumed that the Power Commission is now prepared to award the license to the Montana Power Co. if they can agree on the royalty which is to be paid. That means, I take it, a rejection of the application for a preliminary permit preferred by Mr. Wheeler.

What it was that actuated the Power Commission in thus in effect rejecting the application of Mr. Wheeler I am, of course, not prepared to say, but I am prepared to say how his application has addressed itself to me. Mr. Wheeler has called to see me on many occasions with respect to the matter, and I have at all times indicated to him that he ought very clearly and convincingly to establish to the satisfaction of the ordinary mind that he is financially able to carry on the development if the permit should be awarded to him. He appeared before the commission and submitted a large amount of testimony concerning the possibility of utilizing power in the production of fertilizer of various kinds. Much has been said about his project.

I might say in this connection that the Montana Power Co. offers to pay to the Indians \$1 per horsepower for the average amount of power capable of being developed by the work they are to carry on throughout the year. It is estimated now that that will be somewhere about 68,000 to 70,000 horsepower. Accordingly their proposal is that they shall pay that amount. The figures tendered by the commission through the Secretary of the Interior, as I understand it, fix the rate which they ask of the Montana Power Co. at \$104,000 until the development of power reaches 68,000 horsepower, and after that it increases as the amount of power developed increases.

Mr. Wheeler offers to pay \$1.50 per kilowatt, which is equivalent, it is understood, to \$112.50 per horsepower. That is, if the license should eventually be issued to him that is what he agrees to pay.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. In speaking of the permit applied for by Walter H. Wheeler, as I understand it, the Rocky Mountain Power Co. made application for a permit, too, and that was their only application until after Mr. Wheeler came in asking for a permit, and since that time the Rocky Mountain Power Co. have changed their bid and now ask for a lease instead of a permit.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have not the dates.

Mr. FRAZIER. That is as I recall it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That may be. The Rocky Mountain Power Co. had an application for a preliminary permit. That dates way back in 1921. It may be that after Mr. Wheeler filed his application for a preliminary permit the Rocky Mountain Power Co. came in and asked for a license.

Mr. FRAZIER. I understand that is the case.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am not prepared to say. Mr. Wheeler submitted a large amount of testimony in relation to the development of fertilizer and the possibility of utilizing the power in the production of fertilizer and other electrochemical products. It appears quite likely that Mr. Wheeler addressed communications, which was entirely proper on his part, to corporations and other organizations throughout the country engaged in the production of electrochemical products and had letters from them in relation to the matter. But the testimony is entirely lacking in any assurance whatever that he can find a customer for a single unit of power, and the record is equally lacking in any testimony that would satisfy anybody that he is financially able to expend anything like \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 for the development.

I read as follows at page 86 from the testimony of Mr. Wheeler:

Now, as I have said before, I have found a very keen interest in the fertilizer industry among the largest manufacturers of fertilizer and the best electrochemical concerns in the country in this water power at \$15 per horsepower. I have gone into the matter extensively with a number of these concerns, and have found that they were keenly interested; and I am convinced that they will enter into contracts for the use of this power and establish fertilizer factories in the vicinity of these power sites.

By Mr. FORBES:

Q. Mr. Wheeler, you are referring to some of those concerns that you have interviewed and corresponded with?

A. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORBES. I would like to say to the commission that as I read the statute and understand the rules, it is not incumbent upon an applicant to show executed contracts for the use of power when a preliminary permit or even a license is pending; but it is incumbent upon him to show, first, a market for the power, and, next, financial ability to construct and develop and equip that plant.

I hope the members of the commission will appreciate the situation that we are in, facing the opposition that we have here, and being required more or less to disclose the customers that we might have for the sale of this power. But I am going to ask Mr. Wheeler to mention one or two of the outstanding concerns that he has negotiated with and to state how much interest he found and what their opinion seemed to be upon his project, and anything else he might care to add.

Mr. WHEELER. I have gone into this matter extensively with one concern, who have authorized me to make certain statements to this commission in their behalf. That concern is the Mathieson Alkali Co., of 250 Park Avenue, New York City, one of the largest electrochemical manufacturing concerns in this country and also in the world.

This company is one of the largest chemical fertilizer manufacturers of America. They now have a plant at Niagara Falls and one in Virginia. They manufacture varied chemical products by chemical processes.

I have had extensive correspondence with Mr. E. M. Allen, president of the company, regarding the use of power from Flathead River power sites.

In October I met him in New York by appointment. I met Mr. Allen at his office on Thursday, October 3, at 12.30. He was called out to a meeting at 1 o'clock. We discussed the power matter briefly and made an appointment to see him again at 9.30 the next morning.

I discussed the power matter the next morning until 11 o'clock and arrived at a tentative understanding with him. He told me to draw up a contract for me to submit to his executive committee, and meet him at 3.45 in the afternoon to go over it.

I met him as agreed and submitted the contract to him. He agreed to submit it to his executive committee on Monday, and asked me to meet him again at his office on Tuesday.

I met him on Tuesday morning, and he said that he hadn't been able to hold the meeting, but would do so that day; and he made an appointment to see me the next day at 10 o'clock.

I met him the next day. He told me his committee did not believe that their company would be justified in signing an agreement with me now in advance of my having a permit; but that if the permit is issued to me I could say to the commission that they will put their engineer on the work immediately investigating the power with a view to the construction of an electrochemical plant for the manufacture of fertilizer that will use 100,000 horsepower of prime electric power.

The sum and substance of this is that this company agreed that if he got the permit they would send an engineer out there to see whether at the price fixed they could profitably manufacture fertilizer, and if they could they would enter into a contract.

I continue reading:

Mr. Allen further advised me that his company has a definite plan for the construction of such a plant, and he authorized me to name his company to the commission and to say that he will confirm my statement to the commission by long-distance telephone if they desire to call him.

By Mr. FORBES:

Q. Mr. Wheeler, was this interview with Mr. Allen which you say you had in New York personally subsequent to extended correspondence with him on the subject?—A. That followed extensive correspondence with him.

Q. Can you mention another firm interested in the manufacture of fertilizer which you have found to be keenly interested in the combination of cheap power and raw materials such as they exist in the Montana fields?—A. Well, there are eight of the large chemical fertilizer companies that were actively interested in this matter and with whom I have had considerable correspondence. I have met with a number of them on several different occasions; and, as my attorney has stated, I do not like to disclose the names of all of these companies

at this hearing. But I will say that one of the companies which has shown a very keen interest is Swift & Co., of Chicago.

Q. Do I understand, Mr. Wheeler, that you are not representing to the commission that you have any understandings or executed contracts or options with either of the two companies that you mentioned?—A. I have no contracts with either of the two companies. It is their position very universally—and I think it would be mine if I were in their place—that they do not care to execute a contract with anyone in advance of the issuance of a preliminary permit.

So much for the chance that Mr. Wheeler would have to dispose of his power, which, of course, he could use as the basis for arranging his finances. What is the testimony in relation to his financial ability to carry out an \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000 project for power development? I read from page 126 of the testimony:

By Mr. FORBES:

Q. Have you submitted your estimates of cost of development to any financial houses with the idea of securing an opinion as to the ability of financing the project along the lines you have suggested?—A. Yes, sir; I have submitted this matter to one of the very largest investment banking houses, and they have given me their opinion that the project would be readily financed with the set-up which I have made.

Q. Would you care to give the name of that investment house?—A. Yes; I am willing to do that; it was Rollins & Sons.

By Secretary WILBUR:

Q. Rollins & Sons?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. FORBES:

Q. Where are they located?—A. I believe their principal place of business is Boston. I took the matter up with their Chicago office. The correct name is E. H. Rollins & Sons.

It will be observed that they do not say they will invest in the proposition. They say to him they believe it can be financed. That is all there is to it—that they believe it can be financed. So likewise, Mr. President, Mr. Wheeler submitted the following:

Q. Have you submitted those estimates to the consulting engineers or executives of managing companies?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Or contractors competent to render an opinion?—A. I have submitted them to Mr. Burch and have submitted them to Rollins & Sons. I submitted them to a large contracting firm, which firm has offered, provided the permit and license are issued to me, and sufficient contracts for the sale of the power can be made on the basis which I have outlined—has offered to finance and construct the entire project.

Q. What was the opinion of the finance houses and of Mr. Burch as to the accuracy of your figures?—A. In their opinion they were conservative.

Q. Would you care to name the contracting company that you have referred to?—A. No, sir; I do not wish to do so, because they specifically asked me not to bring their names into this hearing.

Then Mr. Wheeler was interrogated further:

By Mr. FORBES:

Q. Mr. Wheeler, please state whether or not you are yourself financially able to finance the work that would be required of you upon the granting to you of a preliminary permit.—A. I am.

Q. Do you care at this time to offer any reference, financial or otherwise, to demonstrate your ability to finance the permit work?—A. Well, shortly after my application was filed and it was sent to Major Butler at Seattle to make a field report upon, Major Butler wrote me a letter stating that if I cared to do so I could submit some evidence of my financial ability to carry out this project. I took that letter over to Mr. F. N. Prince, who was chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Minneapolis, which is, I believe, the largest bank between Chicago and the Pacific coast, and asked him if he would answer the letter to Major Butler for me, which he did.

And I find, in looking over Major Butler's report, that he has included Mr. Prince's letter in it.

Mr. FORBES. If the chairman please, I am now referring to the report of Maj. John S. Butler, dated March 17, 1928, to the Chief of Engineers, and in turn forwarded to the Federal Power Commission and made part of its files, this document having been produced upon my application yesterday. And I ask that it be considered part of the official record of the hearings.

On page 9 of Major Butler's report the letter of Mr. Prince is set out. The original, I suppose, is somewhere in the files of the commission. It reads:

"I have known Mr. Wheeler for a number of years. He is a man of excellent standing, ability, and integrity, and I believe he has means of his own which would be sufficient to do the preliminary work mentioned, and in connection with the people he has interested with him would be able to fully finance the completion of the work, should license be issued to him."

That is to say, Mr. Prince says he believes Mr. Wheeler has funds of his own adequate to do the preliminary work,

and he believes he has connections with people who are amply able to finance the project. As I have said, I do not know upon what ground the commission, apparently, rejected the application of Mr. Wheeler and chose to negotiate with the Montana Power Co.; but I have always been impressed with the belief that the showing of Mr. Wheeler with respect to his financial ability to carry out this project was of the very weakest character, suggesting that he desires a preliminary permit for three years, and in the meantime he will try to bring about some financial arrangement by which he will be able to carry on the project. Whether he will or whether he will not is a matter of mere doubt and speculation, upon which, I should think, the Federal Power Commission would scarcely be justified in relying.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. As I understand, Walter H. Wheeler has done quite a lot of preliminary work and has gone to considerable expense. I think it would be practically impossible as a business proposition for any big company to make a contract with an engineer who was simply bidding on a permit or even on a lease before he got the permit or lease. Personally, I can not see how he can be expected to get a contract with any fertilizer company or any other industrial company on the basis of an application for a lease or permit. As I understand, however, he is willing to cut down the time limit from three years to two years, and in view of the fact that the site has been undeveloped for all these years in the past two years more would not amount to a great deal anyway.

Of course, my interest is, first, on behalf of the Indians, because I happen to be on the Committee on Indian Affairs and have been on the ground and made a personal investigation. I know the Indians are anxious to have the power site developed, but they are also anxious, of course, to get the best terms and arrangements they can obtain.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, I appreciate the difficulty that Mr. Wheeler would have in getting contracts without having even a preliminary permit. I appreciate how difficult it would be to get contracts even if he had an agreement for the development, because we all realize, Mr. President, that with the enormous development of power at the Boulder Dam there will be all manner of competition from whatever electrochemical development can be made possible in the western section of the country.

I want to say in this connection that the Rocky Mountain Power Co. is practically a paper company, but its proposal is guaranteed by the Montana Power Co., which, of course, has ample resources to carry on the work.

It seems to me that Mr. Wheeler ought either to show contracts for power which would warrant the conclusion that the project could be well financed or else he ought to show financial resources of his own or of others who are associated with him ample to carry out the project. It would seem to me that that would be expected of almost any applicant for a large power development, in order that the permit or the license, as the case might be, might not be hawked around to anybody, the permittee or licensee simply to take off the profit and turn it over to some one else.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FRAZIER. Of course, Mr. Wheeler, as the Senator has indicated, has furnished a large number of letters from various concerns and from banking institutions which he thinks, at least, demonstrate that he can finance the proposition, and also get some power contracts.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I intended to give the Senate a sample of such letters as he has received, and I thought I took a fair sample from quite a large number of letters of that character which he produced.

Mr. FRAZIER. I think the Senator did give a fair sample. On the other hand, the Rocky Mountain Power Co., as I understand, is a very small company—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is quite right.

Mr. FRAZIER. And of itself would not be any more capable of financing the project than would Mr. Wheeler. Its capital stock, as I understand, is only a very few thousand dollars—a very small amount.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Quite so.

Mr. FRAZIER. So that company would not be any more capable, and, perhaps, not so capable, in view of their capital stock, of financing this proposition than would Mr. Wheeler.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Quite so, and accordingly they filed a guaranty by which the Montana Power Co. guaranteed that the Rocky Mountain Power Co. would carry out the contract.

Mr. FRAZIER. Then, Mr. President, I can not see what advantage there would be in making the lease to the Rocky Mountain Power Co. instead of, in the first place, to the Montana Power Co.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Neither can I; I have no information as to why that course was taken; but I can not conceive that that would make any particular difference.

Mr. President, I feel very proud of the compliment paid me by Mr. Marsh, or, rather, by my colleagues in this body, who, when Mr. Marsh importuned them to present his resolution, inquired of him whether it would be opposed by the Senators from Montana, and on being advised that it would be opposed by the Senators from Montana, and particularly that it would be opposed by myself, apparently none of my colleagues were quite willing to offer the resolution for the consideration of the Senate. I should like to think that that was because my colleagues felt that there must be some good reasons why such a resolution as that ought not to be adopted by the Senate, and that if I did oppose it I should be able to offer very substantial reasons why it ought not to be adopted by the Senate. I have endeavored to give those reasons; and I believe that there is no justification for the passage of such a resolution. I think there is no justification whatever for arresting or delaying action by the commission with respect to this project; but there may be some comfort to Mr. Marsh and those associated with him in this matter to be advised, as I am advised to-day, that the Rocky Mountain Power Co. has declined to agree to pay the amount which the Power Commission are exacting as royalty for the lease, so that, for the present at least, the negotiations are terminated.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of Order of Business No. 347, being the bill (H. R. 9806) to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand that is a House bill?

Mr. HOWELL. It is a House bill.

Mr. McNARY. It has been reported favorably by the committee, of course?

Mr. HOWELL. It has been reported favorably by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McNARY. I think, as a rule, it is bad practice to take up a bill on the calendar out of order so late in the day, but inasmuch as it is a bridge bill and has been reported favorably by the committee and there is no opposition to it, as I understand—

Mr. HOWELL. I trust there is no opposition to it; there is none, so far as I know.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the circumstances, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 11, line 5, before the name "Omaha," to strike out "South," so as to make the heading read:

Missouri River at Omaha, Nebr.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 8, after the word "purposes," to strike out "Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near South," and in lieu thereof to insert:

Richard L. Metcalf, mayor of Omaha, Nebr., and his successors in office, Oscar H. Brown, mayor of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and his successors in office, Harry H. Lapidus, of Omaha, Nebr., Mathew E. O'Keefe, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and C. A. Sorensen, Attorney General of the State of Nebraska, and his successors in office, all as trustees, are hereby authorized and empowered to cause to be prepared and to adopt plans and specifications for, and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, and to own and hold the same in trust for said cities of Omaha and Council Bluffs and the

States of Iowa and Nebraska. Said bridge shall be constructed at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Farnam Street.

And on page 12, line 4, after the word "act," to insert:

Said five trustees shall act jointly under the designation and style of "the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees" and in that name may construct, operate, and hold said bridge. No act of said board shall be valid unless concurred in by not less than three members thereof. The first meeting of said board after the passage of this act shall be called not less than 20 days subsequent thereto and by not less than three members thereof, and the written notice of said first meeting shall designate the exact place and time. The board shall select a chairman from its own number but its secretary and treasurer need not be members thereof. The board shall have all the ordinary and usual powers necessary to carry out the purposes of section 3 of this act, and in connection therewith may adopt rules of procedure and by-laws; enter into contracts and employ such managers, agents, and clerical help as may be necessary; fill any vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or refusal and failure to act of any one of the two nonpublic-officer members of the board, or the refusal and failure to act of any one of the three public-officer members of the board. The term of any person selected to fill a vacancy caused by the refusal and failure to act of any one of the three public-officer members shall terminate with the election and qualification of said official member's successor in office.

So as to read:

SEC. 3. (a) That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, Richard L. Metcalf, mayor of Omaha, Nebr., and his successors in office, Oscar H. Brown, mayor of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and his successors in office, Harry H. Lapidus, of Omaha, Nebr., Mathew E. O'Keefe, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and C. A. Sorensen, attorney general of the State of Nebraska, and his successors in office, all as trustees, are hereby authorized and empowered to cause to be prepared and to adopt plans and specifications for, and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, and to own and hold the same in trust for said cities of Omaha and Council Bluffs and the States of Iowa and Nebraska. Said bridge shall be constructed at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act. Said five trustees shall act jointly under the designation and style of "the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees," and in that name may construct, operate, and hold said bridge. No act of said board shall be valid unless concurred in by not less than three members thereof. The first meeting of said board after the passage of this act shall be called not less than 20 days subsequent thereto and by not less than three members thereof, and the written notice of said first meeting shall designate the exact place and time. The board shall select a chairman from its own number, but its secretary and treasurer need not be members thereof. The board shall have all the ordinary and usual powers necessary to carry out the purposes of section 3 of this act, and in connection therewith may adopt rules of procedure and by-laws; enter into contracts and employ such managers, agents, and clerical help as may be necessary; fill any vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or refusal and failure to act of any one of the two nonpublic officer members of the board, or the refusal or failure to act of any one of the three public officer members of the board. The term of any person selected to fill a vacancy caused by the refusal and failure to act of any one of the three public officer members shall terminate with the election and qualification of said official member's successor in office.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 4, after the word "upon," to strike out "Charles B. Morearty, his heirs" and insert "the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its," so as to read:

(b) There is hereby conferred upon the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 18, after the word "said," to strike out "Charles B. Morearty, his heirs," and insert "the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its," and in line 22, after the word "be," to insert "such as will amortize the cost of said bridge within a period

fixed by said board but not to exceed 20 years and such rates of toll so fixed shall be," so as to read:

(c) The said the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its legal representatives, and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be such as will amortize the cost of said bridge within a period fixed by said board but not to exceed 20 years and such rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 5, after the name "Nebraska," to strike out the comma and insert "and"; in the same line, after the name "Iowa," to strike out "any public agency or political subdivision of either of such States, within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two of them" and insert "jointly, or said cities of Omaha and Council Bluffs, jointly, or the counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa"; and in line 14, after the word "said," to strike out "Charles B. Morearty, his heirs," and insert "the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its," so as to read:

(d) If, after the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Nebraska and the State of Iowa, jointly, or said cities of Omaha and Council Bluffs, jointly, or the counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa, jointly, may at any time desire to acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, it shall not be necessary to condemn or expropriate such property, but the said the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its legal representatives and assigns, shall deliver to such public agency, by proper instrument of conveyance, all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches; and no damages or compensation whatsoever shall be allowed for any such right, title, or interest, but if such bridge is so acquired it shall be taken over subject to the bonds, debentures, or other instruments of indebtedness, including accrued interest thereon, actually issued in payment for the bridge, its approaches, and improvements and outstanding at the time of such taking over. Such instrument of conveyance shall be executed and delivered within a period of 30 days after receiving from such public agency a written notice of such intention to take over such property.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 4, after the word "said," to strike out "Charles B. Morearty, his heirs," and insert "the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its," and in line 22, after the word "said," to strike out "Charles B. Morearty, his heirs," and insert "the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its," so as to read:

(f) The said the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees its legal representatives and assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of such bridge file with the Secretary of War and with the highway departments of the States of Nebraska and Iowa a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the amount of bonds, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness issued in connection with the construction of such bridge. The Secretary of War may, and upon request of the highway departments of either of such States shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing and financing such bridge. For the purpose of such investigation the said the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its legal representatives and assigns, shall make available all of his records in connection with the construction and financing thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction and financing of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 3 (d) of this act, subject only to a review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 8, before the word "this" to insert "section 3 of," and in the same line, after the word "to," to strike out "Charles B. Morearty, his heirs" and insert "the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its," so as to read:

(g) The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by section 3 of this act is hereby granted to the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its legal representatives, and assigns; and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may

be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 10, after the word "bridge," to strike out "a commission shall be created, composed of three members, one of whom shall be appointed by the mayor of Omaha, Nebr., one by the mayor of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and one by Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, or assigns; it shall be the duty of the commission" and insert "it shall be the duty thereafter of said board, until said bridge shall be taken over or acquired by such States or political agencies or subdivisions thereof, as provided for in section 3 of this act"; on page 19, line 4, after the word "and," to strike out "Charles B. Morearty, his heirs," and insert "the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its"; in line 10, after the word "jointly," to strike out "or to the highway departments thereof,"; in line 11, before the word "shall," to strike out "or their highway departments"; in line 12, after the word "States," to strike out "or their highway departments"; in line 14, after the word "said," to strike out "Charles B. Morearty, his heirs," and insert "the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its"; in line 17, after the word "either," to strike out "of such States, or to either of the counties thereof" and insert "the State of Nebraska, or the State of Iowa, or to said counties of Douglas and Pottawattamie, jointly"; in line 22, after the word "jointly," to strike out "or to either of them, as shall" and insert "as shall first by duly authorized action"; and in line 24, after the word "bridge," to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, however, That if said two States, due to the fault of one of them shall fail to agree to accept and operate said bridge, jointly, as a free bridge, then in no event shall said board convey said bridge to the State at fault," so as to read:

(i) Upon the completion of such bridge it shall be the duty thereafter of said board, until said bridge shall be taken over or acquired by such States or political agencies or subdivisions thereof, as provided for in section 3 of this act, to supervise the collection of tolls and to authorize and audit all expenditures of money received from the collection of tolls; it shall be their duty to see that all revenues received from the bridge, except such amounts as may be necessary for the repair, operation, and maintenance, under economical management, of the bridge, shall be paid into the sinking fund and used for the amortization of the outstanding indebtedness incurred for the construction or improvement of the bridge. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided the bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls; and the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its legal representatives, and assigns shall thereupon convey, by proper instrument of conveyance, all right, title, and interest in said bridge and its approaches to the State of Nebraska and the State of Iowa, jointly, if such States shall agree to accept and to maintain and operate the same; if such States refuse to agree to accept and maintain and operate the bridge as a free bridge, then the said the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge Board of Trustees, its legal representatives, and assigns shall convey said bridge to either the State of Nebraska, or the State of Iowa, or to said counties of Douglas and Pottawattamie, jointly, in which such bridge is located in whole or in part, or to the cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, jointly, as shall first by duly authorized action agree to accept and maintain and operate the same as a free bridge: *Provided, however,* That if said two States, due to the fault of one of them shall fail to agree to accept and operate said bridge, jointly, as a free bridge, then in no event shall said board convey said bridge to the State at fault.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 4, before the name "Omaha," to insert "South," so as to make the heading read: Missouri River at South Omaha, Nebr.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 4. (a) That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Omaha, Nebr., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

(b) There is hereby conferred upon Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, opera-

tion, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

(c) The said Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

(d) If, after the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Nebraska, the State of Iowa, any public agency or political subdivision of either of such States, within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two of them jointly, may at any time desire to acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, it shall not be necessary to condemn or expropriate such property, but the said Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall deliver to such public agency by proper instrument of conveyance all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches; and no damages or compensation whatsoever shall be allowed for any such right, title, or interest, but if such bridge is so acquired it shall be taken over subject to the bonds, debentures, or other instruments of indebtedness, including accrued interest thereon, actually issued in payment for the bridge, its approaches, and improvements and outstanding at the time of such taking over. Such instrument of conveyance shall be executed and delivered within a period of 30 days after receiving from such public agency a written notice of such intention to take over such property.

(e) If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by such States or public agencies or political subdivisions thereof, or by either of them, as provided in section 4 (d) of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including only those items named in section 4 (d) of this act, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

(f) The said Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of such bridge file with the Secretary of War and with the highway departments of the States of Nebraska and Iowa a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor and the amount of bonds, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness issued in connection with the construction of such bridge. The Secretary of War may, and upon request of the highway departments of either of such States shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing and financing such bridge. For the purpose of such investigation the said Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall make available all of his records in connection with the construction and financing thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction and financing of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 4 (d) of this act, subject only to a review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

(g) The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns; and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

(h) All contracts made in connection with the construction of the bridge authorized by section 4 of this act and which shall involve the expenditure of more than \$5,000 shall be let by competitive bidding. Such contracts shall be advertised for a reasonable time in some newspaper of general circulation published in the States in which the bridge

is located and in the vicinity thereof; sealed bids shall be required and the contracts shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. Verified copies or abstracts of all bids received and of the bid or bids accepted shall be promptly furnished to the highway departments of the States in which the bridge is located. A failure to comply in good faith with the provisions of this section shall render null and void any contract made in violation thereof, and the Secretary of War may, after hearings, order the suspension of all work upon such bridge until the provisions of this section shall have been fully complied with.

(i) Upon the completion of such bridge a commission shall be created, composed of three members, one of whom shall be appointed by the mayor of Omaha, Nebr., one by the mayor of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and one by Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, or assigns. It shall be the duty of the commission to supervise the collection of tolls and to authorize and audit all expenditures of money received from the collection of tolls; it shall be their duty to see that all revenues received from the bridge, except such amounts as may be necessary for the repair, operation, and maintenance, under economical management, of the bridge, shall be paid into the sinking fund and used for the amortization of the outstanding indebtedness incurred for the construction or improvement of the bridge. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided the bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, and Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall thereupon convey, by proper instrument of conveyance, all right, title, and interest in said bridge and its approaches, to the State of Nebraska and the State of Iowa, jointly, or to the highway departments thereof, if such States or their highway departments shall agree to accept and to maintain and operate the same; if such States or their highway departments refuse to agree to accept and maintain and operate said bridge as a free bridge, then the said Charles B. Morearty, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall convey said bridge to either of such States, or to either of the counties thereof in which such bridge is located in whole or in part, or to the cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, jointly, or to either of them, as shall agree to accept and maintain and operate the same as a free bridge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 16, to insert the following section:

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be constructed, maintained, and operated a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near South Omaha, Nebr., and also a bridge at or near Florence, Nebr., by the persons specified in section 3 of this act and in accordance with the authority therein conferred upon such persons and subject to all the provisions and limitations of such section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 8, to insert:

REGULATION OF TOLLS OVER CERTAIN BRIDGES

SEC. 16. In the case of bridges heretofore authorized by acts of Congress specifically reserving to Congress the right to subsequently regulate tolls on such bridges, such bridges shall, in respect of the regulation of all tolls, be subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 17, to change the section number from 16 to 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

GRANT OF LANDS TO CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to-day reported Senate bill 3934. It is a purely local measure, involving a small piece of Federal land in the city of Sault Ste. Marie, which has been in municipal use since 1874. The desire of the city at present is to expand the character of the use. That is the sole involvement in the measure. The bill has the approval of all the departments, and I should greatly appreciate it if we might have action on it this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3934) granting certain lands to the city of Sault Ste. Marie, State of Michigan, which was read, as follows:

Whereas the land donated to school district No. 1, Sault Ste. Marie township, Chippewa County, Mich., under the provisions of the act of

March 3, 1875- (18 Stat. 519), is not being used for the purpose for which granted: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the land donated to school district No. 1, Sault Ste. Marie township, Chippewa County, Mich., under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1875, be, and it is hereby, forfeited to the United States, and the United States hereby resumes the title thereto.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue patent in fee to the city of Sault Ste. Marie, State of Michigan, for the land donated to school district No. 1, Sault Ste. Marie township, Chippewa County, Mich., under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to donate a certain portion of the military reservation at Fort Brady to school district No. 1, in township of Sault Ste. Marie and State of Michigan, for school purposes," approved March 3, 1875, and to make whatever supplemental survey is necessary to secure the definite location, identification, and description of the tract to be conveyed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

BATTLE OF THE MONONGAHELA

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, next July the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of the Monongahela will be celebrated in Pennsylvania. The House has unanimously reported and passed a joint resolution providing for a commission to join in the celebration, without expense to the Government. The Senate committee to-day unanimously authorized a favorable report on the joint resolution.

I present the report and ask for its immediate consideration. As I say, there is no expense to the Government connected with the matter.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) providing for the observance and commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of the Monongahela, and establishing a commission to be known as the United States Battle of the Monongahela Commission, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Battle of the Monongahela Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission) and to be composed of five commissioners, as follows: 1 person to be appointed by the President of the United States, 2 Senators by the President of the Senate, and 2 Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Any vacancy in the office of a commissioner shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The commissioners shall serve without compensation therefor from the United States. The commission shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The commission is authorized to arrange, in cooperation with any organization or society without cost to the United States, an appropriate observance and commemoration to take place in the month of July, 1930, of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of the Monongahela, referred to as "Braddock's defeat," and to participate on behalf of the United States, in such manner as it deems advisable, in any other observance or celebration of such anniversary which may be held in the United States during the year 1930.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

THE VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate executive messages making nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, carrying out the unanimous-consent agreement made earlier in the day, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 14, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of April 8), 1930

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

VETERINARY CORPS

To be second lieutenant

Second Lieut. Ralph William Mohri, Veterinary Corps Reserve, with rank from April 7, 1930.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Staff Sergt. Leonard George Tate Perkins, Medical Department, with rank from April 3, 1930.

Staff Sergt. Harold Lincoln Gard, Medical Department, with rank from April 3, 1930.

Staff Sergt. Joe Edward McKnight, Medical Department, with rank from April 3, 1930.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lieut. Tyree Rivers Horn, Field Artillery (detailed in Signal Corps), with rank from March 13, 1925.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

To be captains

First Lieut. Osgood Cook McIntyre, Field Artillery, from April 3, 1930.

First Lieut. James Emerson Bush, Field Artillery, from April 5, 1930.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Harrison Wells Davison, Cavalry, from April 3, 1930.

Second Lieut. Thomas Claggett Wood, jr., Field Artillery, from April 5, 1930.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Capt. William Donaldson Fleming, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1930.

Capt. Samuel Demetrius Avery, Medical Corps, from April 9, 1930.

Capt. William Robert Lewis Reinhardt, Medical Corps, from April 9, 1930.

To be captain

First Lieut. Merritt Gartley Ringer, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1930.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Stella M. Stallworth to be postmaster at Chapman, Ala., in place of S. M. Stallworth. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1929.

ARIZONA

Charles F. Mater to be postmaster at Morenci, Ariz., in place of C. F. Mater. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1930.

Mary W. Hand to be postmaster at Winkelman, Ariz., in place of C. E. Hand, deceased.

ARKANSAS

James H. Elkins to be postmaster at Blytheville, Ark., in place of J. H. Elkins. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Oscar W. McClintock to be postmaster at Monticello, Ark., in place of O. W. McClintock. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1930.

Shafter A. King to be postmaster at Salem, Ark., in place of W. C. King. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Joseph T. Todd to be postmaster at Smithville, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

CALIFORNIA

Frank J. Biglow to be postmaster at Antioch, Calif., in place of A. C. Webster, resigned.

Christian F. Richter to be postmaster at Auburn, Calif., in place of C. F. Richter. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1930.

Oscar E. Bailey to be postmaster at Avalon, Calif., in place of G. R. Ashbridge, resigned.

Joseph M. Hamilton to be postmaster at Crescent City, Calif., in place of J. M. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1930.

Nels S. Petersen to be postmaster at Del Rey, Calif., in place of W. S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

John L. Pope to be postmaster at Lower Lake, Calif., in place of J. L. Pope. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Miriam I. Paine to be postmaster at Mariposa, Calif., in place of M. I. Paine. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Philip G. Scadden to be postmaster at Nevada City, Calif., in place of P. G. Scadden. Incumbent's position expired March 11, 1930.

Charles H. Silva to be postmaster at Newcastle, Calif., in place of C. H. Silva. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1930.

John Z. Shelton to be postmaster at Oroville, Calif., in place of J. Z. Shelton. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1930.

George E. Cross to be postmaster at Puente, Calif., in place of Wat Tyler. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Shirley S. Abeel to be postmaster at Sebastopol, Calif., in place of S. S. Abeel. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1930.

COLORADO

Mary H. Cowie to be postmaster at Boulder, Colo., in place of M. H. Cowie. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

William J. Orr to be postmaster at Leadville, Colo., in place of A. G. Thomson. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Robert R. Finley to be postmaster at Loveland, Colo., in place of J. H. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

Mary McConnell to be postmaster at Minturn, Colo., in place of Mary McConnell. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1930.

Gwendolyn Oyler to be postmaster at Pritchett, Colo. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

CONNECTICUT

Helen G. Miller to be postmaster at Coscob, Conn., in place of H. G. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1930.

Anders Jacobsen to be postmaster at Stafford Springs, Conn., in place of Anders Jacobsen. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1930.

William P. Gourlie to be postmaster at Thompsonville, Conn., in place of W. P. Gourlie. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

DELAWARE

W. Bateman Cullen to be postmaster at Clayton, Del., in place of W. B. Cullen. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1930.

Robert E. Harrington to be postmaster at Felton, Del., in place of J. W. Godwin. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1930.

William H. Rogers to be postmaster at Frederica, Del., in place of W. H. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

FLORIDA

Effie M. Robinson to be postmaster at Coleman, Fla., in place of E. M. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

GEORGIA

Edwin K. Large to be postmaster at Atlanta, Ga., in place of E. K. Large. Incumbent's commission expires May 17, 1930.

Eldon A. McCollum to be postmaster at Baconton, Ga., in place of E. A. McCollum. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

John P. Herring to be postmaster at Climax, Ga., in place of J. P. Herring. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1930.

Mary L. Ellis to be postmaster at Experiment, Ga., in place of C. L. Claridy, resigned.

Franklin W. Withoft to be postmaster at Fort Valley, Ga., in place of F. W. Withoft. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1930.

Robert L. Williams to be postmaster at Griffin, Ga., in place of R. L. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

John H. Hendrix to be postmaster at Hawkinsville, Ga., in place of J. H. Hendrix. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Jefferson D. Stalvey to be postmaster at Lake Park, Ga., in place of J. D. Stalvey. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

Loyd W. English to be postmaster at Pelham, Ga., in place of L. W. English. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

Emma S. Brindle to be postmaster at Surrency, Ga., in place of E. S. Brindle. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1929.

William O. Wolfe to be postmaster at Uvalda, Ga., in place of H. A. Moses, removed.

Ila M. Simpson to be postmaster at Warwick, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

IDAHO

Joseph Morley to be postmaster at Idaho Falls, Idaho, in place of Joseph Morley. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Guy Swain to be postmaster at Roselake, Idaho, in place of A. H. Smith, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Emma H. Paine to be postmaster at Alpha, Ill., in place of E. H. Paine. Incumbent's commission expired March 27, 1930.

Gustav H. Beckemeyer to be postmaster at Beckemeyer, Ill., in place of G. H. Beckemeyer. Incumbent's commission expired March 27, 1930.

Henry C. Norcross to be postmaster at Carlyle, Ill., in place of H. C. Norcross. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1930.

Edgar C. Seik to be postmaster at Grafton, Ill., in place of E. C. Seik. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1930.

Arthur F. Eberlin to be postmaster at Hardin, Ill., in place of A. F. Eberlin. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1930.

Ira L. Heern to be postmaster at Makanda, Ill., in place of B. H. West, removed.

Asa L. Kiser to be postmaster at Pittsfield, Ill., in place of A. L. Kiser. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Roy C. Tarrant to be postmaster at Versailles, Ill., in place of R. C. Tarrant. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

INDIANA

Ethel J. Pinney to be postmaster at La Crosse, Ind., in place of E. J. Pinney. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1929.

Joseph D. Bartlett to be postmaster at La Fayette, Ind., in place of R. M. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1930.

Stephen M. Isom to be postmaster at Mitchell, Ind., in place of Howard Chitty. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1930.

Harry Kretschman to be postmaster at Otterbein, Ind., in place of C. W. Burkett. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1929.

IOWA

Guy T. Hardenburgh to be postmaster at Baxter, Iowa, in place of W. H. Herzog, resigned.

Lou A. Brink to be postmaster at Clarence, Iowa, in place of L. A. Brink. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Joseph H. Dickens to be postmaster at Diagonal, Iowa, in place of J. H. Dickens. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1930.

Lester J. Garrett to be postmaster at Early, Iowa, in place of Harold Kelley, resigned.

George E. Gates to be postmaster at Edgewood, Iowa, in place of G. A. Gates. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

Clarissa A. Peck to be postmaster at Lawler, Iowa, in place of C. A. Peck. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Laura M. Smith to be postmaster at Montour, Iowa, in place of L. M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1930.

John H. Taylor to be postmaster at New Sharon, Iowa, in place of J. H. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Ida G. Schloeman to be postmaster at Norway, Iowa, in place of I. G. Schloeman. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

George H. Kinney to be postmaster at Stacyville, Iowa, in place of G. H. Kinney. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

Glenn F. Shortess to be postmaster at Traer, Iowa, in place of G. F. Shortess. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1930.

Frederick W. Steele to be postmaster at Walker, Iowa, in place of F. W. Steele. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Boyd W. Smith to be postmaster at Waukon, Iowa, in place of B. W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1930.

KANSAS

Harry T. Hill to be postmaster at Colony, Kans., in place of H. T. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

Mae Boyd to be postmaster at Dorrance, Kans., in place of Mae Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1930.

George D. Gibson to be postmaster at Edmond, Kans., in place of E. M. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Benjamin F. Liebst to be postmaster at Greeley, Kans., in place of B. F. Liebst. Incumbent's commission expired March 26, 1930.

Clare J. Anderson to be postmaster at Gypsum, Kans., in place of C. M. Tinkler. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

Elva M. Woodward to be postmaster at Haviland, Kans., in place of E. M. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Grace Wilson to be postmaster at Hoxie, Kans., in place of M. M. McKinney. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

Floyd B. Martin to be postmaster at Lane, Kans., in place of F. B. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Otto L. Walmer to be postmaster at Lucas, Kans., in place of O. L. Walmer. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Fred T. Elliot to be postmaster at Morrill, Kans., in place of D. M. Meyers. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Ralph E. Ellison to be postmaster at Muscotah, Kans., in place of Carl Rork. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

William F. Greer to be postmaster at St. Francis, Kans., in place of W. F. Greer. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Reuben W. Walquist to be postmaster at Savonburg, Kans., in place of R. W. Walquist. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

KENTUCKY

Henry I. Neely to be postmaster at Hazel, Ky., in place of H. I. Neely. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1930.

Luther G. Bernard to be postmaster at Jamestown, Ky., in place of L. G. Bernard. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1930.

Mattie B. Griffin to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ky., in place of M. B. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1929.

MAINE

Mae L. Jack to be postmaster at Denmark, Me., in place of M. L. Jack. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Etta S. Maddocks to be postmaster at Dryden, Me., in place of D. C. Buck, resigned.

MARYLAND

John M. Reed, jr., to be postmaster at Chesapeake City, Md., in place of J. M. Reed, jr. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1930.

Herbert C. Leighton to be postmaster at Mountain Lake Park, Md., in place of H. C. Leighton. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1930.

Frederick M. Gambrill to be postmaster at White Marsh, Md. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harriett L. Green to be postmaster at East Brookfield, Mass., in place of H. L. Green. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1930.

Ursula G. Dehey to be postmaster at Hatfield, Mass., in place of U. G. Dehey. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1930.

Samuel F. Brown to be postmaster at Indian Orchard, Mass., in place of S. F. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1930.

Delano E. Chase to be postmaster at Linwood, Mass., in place of D. E. Chase. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

MICHIGAN

Henry M. Cosier to be postmaster at Bear Lake, Mich., in place of H. M. Cosier. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Benjamin F. Scamehorn to be postmaster at Bloomingdale, Mich., in place of B. F. Scamehorn. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Herbert E. McElheny to be postmaster at Gobles, Mich., in place of H. E. McElheny. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Harold Stecker to be postmaster at Hermansville, Mich., in place of L. E. Bultman, resigned.

Amos H. Crosby to be postmaster at New Buffalo, Mich., in place of A. H. Crosby. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1930.

Jesse M. Green to be postmaster at Roscommon, Mich., in place of J. M. Green. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

John M. Klipp to be postmaster at Watervliet, Mich., in place of J. M. Klipp. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

MINNESOTA

Emil A. Voelz to be postmaster at Danube, Minn., in place of E. A. Voelz. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Elmer C. Hutchinson to be postmaster at Eagle Bend, Minn., in place of E. C. Hutchinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

William Pennar to be postmaster at Laporte, Minn., in place of William Pennar. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1930.

Wallace R. Ackerman to be postmaster at Mapleton, Minn., in place of W. R. Ackerman. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

MISSISSIPPI

Annie Laws to be postmaster at Hickory Flat, Miss., in place of Annie Laws. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1930.

Kathleen J. Martin to be postmaster at Louise, Miss., in place of K. J. Martin. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Curtis S. Ricketts to be postmaster at Macon, Miss., in place of T. C. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1929.

Marion W. Thornton to be postmaster at Pachuta, Miss., in place of M. W. Thornton. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1930.

Robert R. Smith to be postmaster at Poplarville, Miss., in place of R. R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1930.

Beall A. Brock to be postmaster at West, Miss., in place of W. W. Cain, deceased.

MISSOURI

Kinzie K. Gittings to be postmaster at Chilhowee, Mo., in place of K. K. Gittings. Incumbent's commission expired March 6, 1930.

Vaughn Hammitt to be postmaster at Curryville, Mo., in place of Vaughn Hammitt. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Archie C. Witt to be postmaster at Gower, Mo., in place of A. C. Witt. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1930.

Dwight A. Dawson to be postmaster at Lowry City, Mo., in place of D. A. Dawson. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

John H. Fisher to be postmaster at Sullivan, Mo., in place of J. H. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1930.

MONTANA

Harry D. Crandall to be postmaster at Bainville, Mont., in place of C. W. Allison, resigned.

Pauline Polutnik to be postmaster at Belt, Mont., in place of R. H. Bemis, deceased.

Mary J. Tasa to be postmaster at Flaxville, Mont., in place of M. J. Tasa. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1930.

Blanche E. Breckenridge to be postmaster at Grassrange, Mont., in place of B. E. Breckenridge. Incumbent's commission expires April 15, 1930.

Francis P. Blair to be postmaster at Richey, Mont., in place of H. O. Gregg, removed.

NEBRASKA

Alvin O. Jones to be postmaster at Adams, Nebr., in place of A. O. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Daniel B. Dick to be postmaster at Cambridge, Nebr., in place of Esther Schwerdtfeger. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

John T. Bierbower to be postmaster at Giltner, Nebr., in place of J. T. Bierbower. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Howard L. Sergeant to be postmaster at Juniata, Nebr., in place of H. L. Sergeant. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Minnie Johansen to be postmaster at Loup City, Nebr., in place of Minnie Johansen. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Edith R. Hunt to be postmaster at Niobrara, Nebr., in place of F. L. Hunt, deceased.

Clarence Rosecrans to be postmaster at Odell, Nebr., in place of Clarence Rosecrans. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Rolland C. Shetler to be postmaster at Riverton, Nebr., in place of R. C. Shetler. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Stewart J. Kennedy to be postmaster at St. Edward, Nebr., in place of C. C. Wake. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1930.

Philip J. Seefus to be postmaster at Scotia, Nebr., in place of T. W. Cook, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Raymond E. Kelley to be postmaster at Center Harbor, N. H., in place of A. A. Bennett, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Charles H. Conner to be postmaster at Bayonne, N. J., in place of C. H. Conner. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Stephen H. Dayton to be postmaster at Mountain Lakes, N. J., in place of L. C. Higgins, resigned.

Edward W. Vanaman to be postmaster at Newfield, N. J., in place of E. W. Vanaman. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1930.

Luther J. Higinson to be postmaster at Oradell, N. J., in place of G. F. Moore, resigned.

Harry J. Manning to be postmaster at South Plainfield, N. J., in place of H. J. Manning. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

NEW YORK

Harold F. Kimball to be postmaster at Ballston Lake, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

George E. Rockwood to be postmaster at Bombay, N. Y., in place of R. S. Barlow. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Walter Carr to be postmaster at Chappaqua, N. Y., in place of Walter Carr. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Daphne M. Brehme to be postmaster at Greenlawn, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

C. Homer Hook to be postmaster at Greenville, N. Y., in place of C. H. Hook. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Sara H. Scott to be postmaster at Hague, N. Y., in place of B. M. Burt. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

George P. Baumer to be postmaster at Kendall, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

Clinton D. Drumm to be postmaster at Malverne, N. Y., in place of C. D. Drumm. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

Theodore W. Cook to be postmaster at Montauk, N. Y., in place of J. E. Harris, removed.

Chester J. Hinman to be postmaster at Palenville, N. Y., in place of C. J. Hinman. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1930.

George M. Grant to be postmaster at Parksville, N. Y., in place of G. M. Grant. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

James R. Rodman to be postmaster at Port Ewen, N. Y., in place of J. R. Rodman. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Sutherland Lent to be postmaster at Sloatsburg, N. Y., in place of Sutherland Lent. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

Howard M. Brush to be postmaster at Smithtown Branch, N. Y., in place of H. M. Brush. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1930.

NORTH CAROLINA

Loyd V. Sorrell to be postmaster at Cary, N. C., in place of L. V. Sorrell. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Dorsie C. Upton to be postmaster at Cherryville, N. C., in place of J. B. Houser. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Mary W. Turner to be postmaster at Gatesville, N. C., in place of M. W. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1930.

Lula G. Harris to be postmaster at Macon, N. C., in place of L. G. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1930.

Charles R. Grant to be postmaster at Mebane, N. C., in place of C. R. Grant. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

James L. Sheek to be postmaster at Mocksville, N. C., in place of J. L. Scheek. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Maud A. Murray to be postmaster at Moyock, N. C., in place of F. E. Schlabach, resigned.

Wade E. Vick to be postmaster at Robersonville, N. C., in place of W. E. Vick. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

Gideon T. Matthews to be postmaster at Rocky Mount, N. C., in place of G. T. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

Albert P. Clayton to be postmaster at Roxboro, N. C., in place of A. P. Clayton. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1930.

William E. Linney to be postmaster at Wilkesboro, N. C., in place of W. E. Linney. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

NORTH DAKOTA

Howard S. Powlison to be postmaster at Wheatland, N. Dak., in place of R. M. Mares, resigned.

OHIO

Helen M. Roley to be postmaster at Basil, Ohio, in place of H. M. Roley. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1930.

Harry E. Hawley to be postmaster at Mansfield, Ohio, in place of H. E. Hawley. Incumbent's commission expires May 6, 1930.

Edward W. Williams to be postmaster at New Carlisle, Ohio, in place of E. W. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

Monto B. Coffin to be postmaster at New Vienna, Ohio, in place of M. B. Coffin. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1930.

Albert E. Gale to be postmaster at Lima, Ohio, in place of A. E. Gale. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1930.

Edwin M. Stover to be postmaster at Oakwood, Ohio, in place of E. M. Stover. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

Francis M. Hiatt to be postmaster at Spring Valley, Ohio, in place of F. M. Hiatt. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1930.

Jesse A. Hayes to be postmaster at Stockport, Ohio, in place of J. A. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Elmer E. Garner to be postmaster at Tiltonsville, Ohio, in place of M. C. Lauer. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

George W. Smith to be postmaster at Wheelersburg, Ohio, in place of G. W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

OKLAHOMA

Gavin D. Duncan to be postmaster at Boswell, Okla., in place of G. D. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Zee Schlein to be postmaster at Clemseot, Okla., in place of Viola Smith, resigned.

Thomas E. Miller to be postmaster at Francis, Okla., in place of T. E. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

John M. Tyler to be postmaster at Idabel, Okla., in place of J. M. Tyler. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

Ida A. McAdams to be postmaster at Minco, Okla., in place of S. C. McAdams, deceased.

Marshal H. Whaley to be postmaster at Morrison, Okla., in place of M. H. Whaley. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Grace M. Johnson to be postmaster at Mulhall, Okla., in place of G. M. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Rita Lewis to be postmaster at Snomac, Okla., in place of S. M. Stone, removed.

OREGON

Frank L. Laughrige to be postmaster at Condon, Oreg., in place of F. L. Laughrige. Incumbent's commission expired March 6, 1930.

Ralph R. Huron to be postmaster at La Grande, Oreg., in place of R. R. Huron. Incumbent's commission expires April 14, 1930.

PENNSYLVANIA

Arthur A. Butz to be postmaster at Alburtis, Pa., in place of A. A. Butz. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Ira R. Burns to be postmaster at Bellwood, Pa., in place of I. R. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1930.

John R. Diemer to be postmaster at Catawissa, Pa., in place of J. R. Diemer. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1930.

Charles S. Bentley to be postmaster at Corry, Pa., in place of C. S. Bentley. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1930.

Anna M. Hess to be postmaster at Duncansville, Pa., in place of A. M. Hess. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1930.

John W. Aumiller to be postmaster at Eagles Mere, Pa., in place of J. W. Aumiller. Incumbent's commission expires April 14, 1930.

David K. Mead to be postmaster at Glenfield, Pa., in place of E. K. Schofield, resigned.

Hattie C. Liston to be postmaster at Isabella, Pa., in place of H. G. Miller, resigned.

Claire A. Bower to be postmaster at Mather, Pa., in place of J. H. Evans, resigned.

Frank A. Householder to be postmaster at Oakmont, Pa., in place of F. A. Householder. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1930.

Archibald E. Patterson to be postmaster at Orangeville, Pa., in place of A. E. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1930.

John F. Harshey to be postmaster at Penn, Pa., in place of J. F. Harshey. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1930.
Charles A. Graeff to be postmaster at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., in place of C. A. Graeff. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1930.

Harry P. Medland to be postmaster at Waymart, Pa., in place of H. P. Medland. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1930.

RHODE ISLAND

Lloyd B. Langworthy to be postmaster at Ashaway, R. I., in place of A. G. Lewis, resigned.

George W. Burgess to be postmaster at Pawtucket, R. I., in place of G. W. Burgess. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1930.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Dewey Stephens to be postmaster at Dillon, S. C., in place of W. J. Galloway, resigned.

William B. Gross to be postmaster at Holly Hill, S. C., in place of W. B. Gross. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Stephen E. Leverette to be postmaster at Iva, S. C., in place of Lemuel Reid, resigned.

Harris P. DuBose to be postmaster at Jefferson, S. C., in place of S. J. Miller, resigned.

Louis Stackley to be postmaster at Kingstree, S. C., in place of Louis Stackley. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Horace A. White to be postmaster at Simpsonville, S. C., in place of H. A. White. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Samuel G. Mortimer to be postmaster at Belle Fourche, S. Dak., in place of S. G. Mortimer. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1930.

Emanuel W. Aisenbrey to be postmaster at Menno, S. Dak., in place of E. V. Schnaidt. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

TENNESSEE

Charles L. Bitner to be postmaster at Chuckey, Tenn., in place of C. L. Bitner. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1930.

Glenn C. Hodges to be postmaster at Cowan, Tenn., in place of G. C. Hodges. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1930.

Thomas W. Thompson to be postmaster at Mount Juliet, Tenn., in place of T. W. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

TEXAS

James T. Shaw, jr., to be postmaster at Anna, Tex., in place of J. T. Shaw, jr. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Roy K. Duphorne to be postmaster at Aransas Pass, Tex., in place of R. K. Duphorne. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Myrtle W. Meyer to be postmaster at Archer City, Tex., in place of J. A. Meyer, removed.

Arthur H. O'Kelley to be postmaster at Atlanta, Tex., in place of A. H. O'Kelley. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Benno B. Volkening to be postmaster at Bellville, Tex., in place of B. B. Volkening. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1930.

Gerhard Dube to be postmaster at Bishop, Tex., in place of Gerhard Dube. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Lee Brown to be postmaster at Blanco, Tex., in place of Lee Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1930.

Alois J. Skardo to be postmaster at Bloomington, Tex., in place of A. J. Skardo. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Nancy Lehmann to be postmaster at Boerne, Tex., in place of Nancy Lehmann. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Robert S. Brennand to be postmaster at Colorado, Tex., in place of R. S. Brennand. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Leo Yell to be postmaster at Conroe, Tex., in place of Leo Yell. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1930.

Opal Farris to be postmaster at Daisetta, Tex., in place of Opal Farris. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1929.

William C. Guest to be postmaster at Dayton, Tex., in place of W. C. Guest. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Andrew Schmidt to be postmaster at Edna, Tex., in place of Andrew Schnridt. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Okey B. Cline to be postmaster at Emory, Tex., in place of O. B. Cline. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1930.
William Reese to be postmaster at Floresville, Tex., in place of William Reese. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1930.

McKinley H. Frank to be postmaster at Grapevine, Tex., in place of M. H. Frank. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Marion Dillon to be postmaster at Happy, Tex., in place of Eva Currie, resigned.

William L. Allen to be postmaster at Hawkins, Tex., in place of W. L. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

James W. Johnson to be postmaster at Italy, Tex., in place of J. W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

John F. Range to be postmaster at Justin, Tex., in place of J. F. Range. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1928.

Joel W. Moore to be postmaster at McDade, Tex., in place of J. M. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

Alide Schneider to be postmaster at Marion, Tex., in place of Alide Schneider. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Thomas L. Darden to be postmaster at Meridian, Tex., in place of T. L. Darden. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Arthur C. Wahl to be postmaster at Odem, Tex., in place of A. C. Wahl. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

John W. Neese to be postmaster at Pflugerville, Tex., in place of J. W. Neese. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1930.

Hermon R. Ivie to be postmaster at Point, Tex., in place of H. R. Ivie. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1930.

Leland S. Howard to be postmaster at Roscoe, Tex., in place of L. S. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Ralph D. Sterling to be postmaster at Somerville, Tex., in place of R. D. Sterling. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1930.

Hugh D. Burleson to be postmaster at Streetman, Tex., in place of H. D. Burleson. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1930.

Mary E. Holtzclaw to be postmaster at Tatum, Tex., in place of M. E. Holtzclaw. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

UTAH

Frank M. Shafer to be postmaster at Moab, Utah, in place of F. M. Shafer. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1930.

VIRGINIA

Edward A. Lindsey to be postmaster at Boyce, Va., in place of E. A. Lindsey. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1930.

Mary F. Cunningham to be postmaster at Fort Myer, Va., in place of M. F. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1930.

Ruth E. Orrison to be postmaster at Hamilton, Va., in place of R. E. Orrison. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1930.

Lilly G. Cook to be postmaster at Madison, Va., in place of L. G. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1930.

Robert E. Newman to be postmaster at Manassas, Va., in place of R. E. Newman. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1930.

James W. Moore to be postmaster at Rapidan, Va., in place of J. W. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1930.

Mandy K. Payne to be postmaster at Remington, Va., in place of T. C. McConchie. Removed.

James R. Miller to be postmaster at Strasburg, Va., in place of J. R. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1930.

WASHINGTON

George D. Montfort to be postmaster at Blaine, Wash., in place of G. D. Montfort. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1930.

Helen L. Hadenfeldt to be postmaster at Mukilteo, Wash., in place of H. L. Hadenfeldt. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1930.

Lawrence C. McLean to be postmaster at Selleck, Wash., in place of L. C. McLean. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1930.

Fanny I. Jennings to be postmaster at Spangle, Wash., in place of F. E. Jennings. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1930.

May V. Garrison to be postmaster at Sumas, Wash., in place of M. V. Garrison. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1930.

H. Robert Nelson to be postmaster at Wilkeson, Wash., in place of H. R. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1930.

WEST VIRGINIA

Henry N. Murphy to be postmaster at Anawalt, W. Va., in place of H. N. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Hattie Brown to be postmaster at Bramwell, W. Va., in place of Hattie Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

Harper B. Kinzer to be postmaster at Ethel, W. Va., in place of L. E. Winston, resigned.

Mary E. Hill to be postmaster at Mabscott, W. Va., in place of J. P. Peck. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Raymond Walls to be postmaster at Man, W. Va., in place of J. M. Stratton, removed.

Easter Y. Shafer to be postmaster at Rupert, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

Jesse H. Miller to be postmaster at Switchback, W. Va., in place of J. C. Turley, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Victor F. Platta to be postmaster at Hatley, Wis., in place of V. F. Platta. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Frank E. Munroe to be postmaster at Ladysmith, Wis., in place of F. E. Munroe. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1930.

Carl C. Corbett to be postmaster at Plymouth, Wis., in place of A. W. Wiggin, removed.

John H. Zahrt to be postmaster at Sparta, Wis., in place of J. H. Zahrt. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

WYOMING

Charles A. Ackenhausen to be postmaster at Worland, Wyo., in place of C. A. Ackenhausen. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, April 11, 1930

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TILSON].

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinitely Holy Father, we ask Thee to maintain Thy covenant with us, that by Thy gentleness and sweet attractions we may be drawn more and more to Thee. Thou art not only a God of wisdom and a God of might, for we discern Thee in the wonders of our deepest loves, in the beauty and glory of Thy all-abounding mercy and goodness. Over against every yearning, over against every temptation, over against every fear, over against every affliction is Thy beloved Son, meeting every want and supplying every need. May the memory of Him who took little children in His arms and put His holy hands upon their heads and blessed them, direct and encourage us until the latest year of our earthly lives. Do Thou inspire our faith in the glorified cross of the Saviour of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10865. An act to authorize Brig. Gen. William S. Thayer, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, and Brig. Gen. William H. Welch, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, to accept the awards of the French Legion of Honor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6564. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8531. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Wednesday the 16th, which would be the Calendar Wednesday of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, be exchanged to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, by agreement with that committee, which would have the 23d, and that the latter committee, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, have the 16th, and that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have the 23d.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Committees on Rivers and Harbors and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, by agreement between themselves, may exchange the next two Calendar Wednesday days so that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee may have Wednesday the 16th and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors the 23d. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would be glad if some one from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries would give us information as to what will be brought up on that Wednesday, particularly with reference to the construction program bill which was passed in the last Congress and vetoed by the President. Is that bill to be brought up on that Wednesday?

Mr. LEHLBACH. What is that bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. The fish cultural station bill.

Mr. LEHLBACH. No; that will not be brought up. It is proposed to bring up a bill amending in certain administrative particulars the radio act and possibly a bill permitting the Government to dispose of certain property in the form of piers to which it now holds title.

Mr. CRAMTON. My only interest was in the bill I mentioned.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I might say further that this interchange does not in any way inconvenience the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, but will materially assist in the orderly presentation of the business of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Without seeking to bind the committee, does the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries intend to bring up any bill amending or changing the merchant marine act of 1928 and amendments thereof?

Mr. LEHLBACH. No; only in so far as the disposal of certain terminals is concerned.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But not ships?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Not ships.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York the object of transferring from the 16th to the 23d?

Mr. DEMPSEY. While we have the consideration of the bill practically completed, it would be almost impossible, if not quite impossible, to be ready for next Wednesday, but we will be ready for the succeeding Wednesday.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman and myself have had a number of conversations about the passage of a rivers and harbors bill. I have been told for the last two months that within a week this bill would be ready; that within a week it certainly would be ready; it would be ready not later than the 15th, and the other day I queried the gentleman from New York, and he said it would be reported not later than next Monday. What is the reason for the delay? Is it for the purpose of defeating this legislation?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No. The reason is just this: There has been no rivers and harbors bill for three years. We have been obliged to consider something over 100 projects, many of them involving highly controversial questions which required a very great deal of time, both in the committee and by the chairman personally outside of the committee. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that the chairman of the committee has been working literally pretty nearly night and day and Sundays.

Mr. GARNER. I take it, the chairman has been working outside of the committee room?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me tell the gentleman. There are in this bill some items that required very prolonged and very delicate handling in order to insure our having a rivers and harbors bill, and instead of the delay threatening the passage of the bill, the delay, I believe, will insure practically, if not entirely, complete harmony in the consideration of the bill before the House. I can not see myself where we are going to

have any real contest or real objection to the bill. I think that the gentlemen who believed they had highly controversial questions have been entirely satisfied, and I think that is going to be true of every important question in the bill.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman will yield further, the President of the United States urged waterways as one of the principal things he wanted to have accomplished by this Congress. He not only urged it in his message but in his speeches prior to the election and after the election. Now we are reaching the latter part of the session, and the gentleman's committee has not yet been able to report a bill. There are rumors to the effect that when this bill is reported it will pass the House of Representatives. As the gentleman knows, he could have brought the bill up two months ago if he had wanted to do so. I understand that when the bill goes to the other end of the Capitol that certain Senators, on account of possible legislation in the bill, will undertake to defeat it, if necessary, by filibustering. What does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I was advised of the rumor which the gentleman mentioned and I was also told yesterday in what I regard as a perfectly dependable and wholly reliable way that all of that rumor of filibuster had disappeared.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman has been conferring with the President of the United States?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And the President of the United States, if I understand it, desires a rivers and harbors bill passed at this session?

Mr. DEMPSEY. He is very earnest for it.

Mr. GARNER. Is that correct?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is correct.

Mr. GARNER. And the gentleman is going to bring the bill in on the 23d?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. For the purpose of passing it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. We expect to pass it; yes.

Mr. GARNER. And there will be no question about it next Wednesday week.

Mr. DEMPSEY. None at all.

Mr. GARNER. I queried the gentleman about the matter last week and he assured me that he would have it ready on Monday and the bill would be considered on Wednesday, and in view of the several conversations we have had I would like to have it just as specific as the English language can possibly make it that we will consider it on the 23d.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say in answer to the gentleman that the committee has been most diligent. It has not been through any lack of work, through any lack of effort, or through any lack of desire; it has simply been because we have met with obstacles, and the chairman has met with obstacles outside of the committee room, and it was necessary in the interest of the speedy and the practically unanimous passage of the bill to dispose of that.

I will also say to the gentleman I believe every one of them of any consequence has been adjusted, and I do not think there will be anything to what the gentleman has heard by way of rumor with respect to action in the other body. I think the bill will pass there just as readily and by just as big a vote as it will here.

Mr. GARNER. I hope that statement is correct.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me ask the gentleman this question: If this unanimous-consent request is granted by the House to-day, is there any way by which any question could arise whereby we would be prevented from presenting this bill to the House on the 23d?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not know of any.

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, the question of consideration can always be raised. You would be in the same position then as you would be on the 16th.

Mr. STAFFORD. And also, I may say, Mr. Speaker, there could be raised the question of whether it is privileged under the rules to be considered on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I could not hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] when he was under the grueling cross-examination by the gentleman from Texas. Just what is it that has delayed the presenting of this epoch making bill that the gentleman is going to bring in?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, two things. The situation is somewhat the same as the one with respect to the committee of the gentleman from Texas, the Ways and Means Committee. They had the tariff bill and they had about six months before we convened to consider it. When we came back here, we had not had a rivers and harbors bill for three years, when ordinarily we have one each year. We ought to have one each year, but owing to peculiar circumstances we had not had one

for three years. The result was the accumulation of an enormous number of projects, many of them long projects. For instance, we had one report of between 800 and 900 printed pages. We had many reports of great length, and in order to deal fairly with the projects and at the same time be assured that the interests of the Government were protected it was necessary to carefully consider these projects.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I understand that, but may I ask the gentleman, without intending to be offensive and in all kindness, is there any trading going on just now?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Trading is not possible. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6564) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, ask for a conference, and appoint conferees; and in presenting this request, I may say I have discussed the matter with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], and this request is agreeable to him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6564, the Interior Department appropriation bill, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and announces the following conferees: Messrs. CRAMTON, MURPHY, and TAYLOR of Colorado.

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation be authorized some time next week to hold an evening session of the committee to take testimony concerning certain medical subjects.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Simply to have a hearing.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman mean while the House is in session?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the Chair whether this request is necessary unless the House should happen to be in session that evening, which is not likely to occur?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It does not seem to the Chair necessary unless the House should be in session.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman is seeking our approval, he can be assured of that.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The House might be in session at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PROBABLE COST OF THE DEBENTURE SYSTEM

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter and tables prepared by the Tariff Commission giving an estimate of the probable cost of the debenture system as outlined in identical bills presented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] and myself, prepared in cooperation with the master of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated by him. Is there objection?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Reserving the right to object, a table was placed in the RECORD showing the benefit to different agricultural commodities and also burdens on the Treasury on March 13 last by myself. Are the tables the gentleman wants to insert the same that were inserted by me?

Mr. JONES of Texas. They are not the same tables, but are prepared on the same basis. The gentleman's proposal covered all commodities that could be possibly classed as agricultural, and did not apply to any bill ever presented in either body.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, yes; there was such a bill in the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Texas. No; the bill pending in the Senate, the Norris amendment leaves it optional and discretionary with the Farm Board to place a debenture on any agricultural commodities.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The Norris amendment is in the tariff bill. I had reference to another bill in the Senate which would make it mandatory on all agricultural products.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The Senate never took any favorable action on that bill, and it was introduced by an individual Senator.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is true, and there was also a bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM], which differed from the Norris plan.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It differs in this, that it uses practically the same basis but sets out specific schedules. The gentleman understands that in the ordinary classification under our tariff system a great many commodities are classified as agricultural that are not strictly in that class, and ought not to be so classed in any plan to relieve agriculture. This table sets out specific articles as natural agricultural commodities. The bills prepared by Mr. KETCHAM and myself also give authority to include other farm commodities in the event of an emergency, which might increase the cost somewhat. But this table includes all of the mandatory schedules.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I have no objection; but I shall examine with interest the tables the gentleman inserts.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I think the gentleman may do so with profit; at least, I hope he finds them informative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter and tables prepared by the Tariff Commission giving an estimate of the probable cost of the debenture system.

The matter is as follows:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, April 9, 1930.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JONES: In accordance with your verbal request of April 4 to Mr. Lewis, we are sending the inclosed tabulations of estimates of debentures payable under H. R. 2667.

The tables are identical with those sent you April 4, except that the calculations are made on the basis of exports during the calendar year 1929 rather than on the basis of the 5-year average annual exports during the period 1925-1929.

You will note that the grand total of the estimated debentures payable under the bill as calculated on the basis of exports during 1929 amounts to \$137,000,000, as compared with \$141,000,000 on the basis of exports during the 5-year period 1925-1929.

Sincerely yours,

E. B. BROSSARD, Chairman.

A.—Debentures payable under section 7 (a), H. R. 12893, calculated on the basis of exports during the calendar year 1929

Commodity	Unit	Para- graph No.	Debenture rate	Quantity of exports, 1929	Debenture costs	Notes
Hogs	Number	1	¾ cent per pound	27,017	\$16,886	On assumption of average weight of 250 pounds per head.
Pork:						
Fresh	Pound	1	¾ cent per pound	13,539,070	50,772	
Wiltshire sides, shoulder sides, and hams	do	1	1 cent per pound	5,039,034	50,390	
Hams and shoulders, cured	do	1	do	125,796,825	1,257,968	
Bacon	do	1	do	138,423,370	1,384,234	
Cumberland sides	do	1	do	5,858,054	58,581	
Pickled	do	1	do	44,787,116	447,871	
Canned	do	1	do	10,239,914	102,399	
Sausage, not canned	do	1	do	3,724,042	37,240	
Sausage, canned	do	1	do	2,139,100	21,391	
Lard	do	1	½ cent per pound	847,867,918	4,239,340	
Cattle:						
Breeding bulls	Number	2	¾ cent per pound	2,196	13,176	Assuming 800 pounds per head.
Breeding cows	do	2	1 cent per pound	1,376	16,512	Assuming 1,200 pounds per head.
Other cattle	do	2	¾ cent per pound	3,937	14,764	Assuming 500 pounds per head.
Beef and veal, fresh	Pound	2	1½ cents per pound	2,917,859	43,768	
Corn	Bushel	3	7½ cents per bushel of 56 pounds	33,745,270	2,530,895	
Corn meal	Barrel	3	15 cents per 100 pounds	267,121	78,534	Assuming 196 pounds per barrel.
Hominy and corn grits	Pound	3	do	14,353,857	21,576	
Corn starch and corn flour	do	3	do	235,041,590	352,562	
Rice	do	4	¾ cent per pound	315,441,412	1,577,207	
Rice flour, meal, and broken rice	do	4	¾ cent per pound	70,593,595	176,484	
Wheat	Bushel	5	21 cents per bushel of 60 pounds	90,129,600	18,927,216	
Wheat flour	Barrel	5	52 cents per 100 pounds	13,663,457	13,925,795	Do.
Total of items other than cotton and tobacco					45,345,561	
Cotton, unmanufactured	Pound	6	2 cents per pound	3,481,509,485	69,630,190	
Leaf tobacco	do	7	do	555,415,451	11,108,309	
Grand total					126,084,060	

B.—Debentures payable under section 7 (c) (1), H. R. 12893, calculated on the basis of exports during the calendar year 1929, at debenture rates equal to one-half the duties in H. R. 2667 as passed by the House

Commodity	Unit	Par. No., House bill 2667	Tariff classification of commodity, one-half the duty on which is used as the debenture rate.	Tariff rate	Quantity or value of exports, 1929	Deben- ture cost
Wheat:						
Biscuits and crackers—						
Plain		733	Biscuits, etc.	30 per cent ad valorem	\$1,114,887	\$167,233
Sweetened		733	do	do	\$916,221	137,433
Macaroni, etc.	Pound	725	Macaroni, etc., containing no eggs	2 cents per pound	10,740,479	107,405
Breakfast foods—						
Ready to eat		732	Cereal breakfast foods	20 per cent ad valorem	\$181,511	18,151
To be cooked		732	do	do	\$140,740	14,074
Corn:						
Breakfast foods ready to eat		732	do	do	\$525,341	52,534
Corn oil		54	Oils, n. s. p. f.	do	\$42,329	4,233
Glucose (corn sirup)	Pound	503	Dextrose	2 cents per pound	118,523,086	1,185,231
Grape sugar (corn sugar)	do	503	do	do	7,238,983	72,390
Swine:						
Lard compounds containing animal fats	do	703	Lard compounds and lard sub- stitutes.	5 cents per pound	3,632,219	90,805
Cattle:						
Beef and veal, pickled or cured	do	706	Meats, preserved	6 cents per pound but not less than 20 per cent.	10,824,870	324,746
Beef, canned	do	706	do	do	\$1,321,002	
Oleo oil	do	701	Oleo oil	1 cent per pound	2,606,162	26,062
Oleo stock	do	701	Tallow	¼ cent per pound	\$945,462	341,044
Tallow	do	701	Tallow	do	68,208,850	20,238
Oleo and lard stearin	do	701	Oleo oil	1 cent per pound	8,095,202	9,600
Oleomargarine of animal and vegetable fats	do	709	Oleomargarine	14 cents per pound	3,840,020	19,653
Meat extracts and bouillon cubes	do	705	Extract of meat, including fluid	15 cents per pound	901,625	63,114
Gelatin	do	42	Edible gelatin, valued at 40 cents or more per pound.	20 per cent and 7 cents per pound.	185,116	13,584
					299,629	26,305
Total					\$168,696	2,762,620

¹ Specific rate used.

² Ad valorem rate used.

C.—Debentures payable under section 7 (c) (2), H. R. 12893, calculated on the basis of equivalent exports of raw cotton or leaf tobacco at the raw cotton or leaf tobacco debenture rates

Commodity	Unit	Debenture rate	Conversion factor	Quantity or value of exports, 1929	Equivalent exports of raw materials	Debenture costs
(1) COTTON PRODUCTS						
Cotton mill waste	Pound	2 cents per pound	1.1	59,129,559	65,042,515	\$1,300,850
Cotton rags, except paper stock	do	do	1.18	21,095,634	24,892,848	497,857
Cotton batting, carded cotton, and roving	do	do	1.05	446,301	468,616	9,372
Cotton yarn:						
Carded yarns, not combed	do	do	1.18	13,919,250	16,424,715	328,494
Combed yarns	do	do	1.43	13,571,962	19,407,906	388,158
Cotton thread and cordage:						
Sewing thread	do	do	1.43	1,053,882	1,507,051	30,141
Crochet, darning, and embroidery cotton	do	do	1.43	82,825	118,440	2,369
Twine and cordage	do	do	1.18	4,588,069	5,413,921	108,278
Cotton cloth, duck, and tire fabric:						
Tire fabric—						
Cord	Square yard	do	1.25	4,969,963	6,212,454	124,249
Other	do	do	1.25	1,355,239	1,694,049	33,881
Cotton duck—						
Heavy filter paper, dryer hose, and belting duck	do	do	2.36	688,618	1,625,138	32,503
Unbleached, ounce and number	do	do	1.18	10,294,888	12,147,968	242,959
Bleached	do	do	1.18	2,293,417	2,706,232	54,125
Colored	do	do	1.18	1,842,948	2,174,679	43,494
Cotton cloth, unbleached	do	do	0.34	137,836,942	47,127,841	942,557
Cotton cloth, bleached	do	do	0.25	89,303,349	22,604,385	452,087
Cotton cloth, colored	do	do	0.27	233,370,528	62,216,396	1,244,327
All other piece-dyed fabrics	do	do	0.21	43,918,973	9,441,527	188,831
All other yarn-dyed fabrics	do	do	0.22	19,807,137	4,357,570	87,151
Cotton and rayon mixtures (chief value cotton)	do	do	0.22	18,766,787	4,128,693	82,574
Other cotton fabrics:						
Blankets	Pound	do	1.25	1,569,156	1,961,445	39,229
Damasks	Square yard	do	0.37	780,072	288,627	5,773
Pile fabrics, plushes, velveteen, corduroys	do	do	0.74	494,061	365,605	7,312
Tapestry and other upholstery goods	do	do	1.00	293,125	293,125	5,862
Cotton fabrics sold by the pound	Pound	do	1.17	10,129,620	11,851,655	237,033
Cotton wearing apparel:						
Knit goods—						
Gloves	Dozen pairs	do	1.20	125,563	150,676	3,014
Hosiery	do	do	1.63	3,777,534	6,148,867	122,977
Underwear	Dozen	do	12	610,616	7,327,392	146,548
Sweaters, shawls, and other knit outerwear	Number	do	1.50	504,912	757,368	15,147
Other wearing apparel—						
Collars and cuffs	Dozen	do	(1)	231,206		
Cotton overalls, breeches, and pants	do	do	(1)	53,965		
Underwear, not knit	do	do	(1)	116,511		
Shirts	do	do	8	236,450	1,891,600	37,832
Dresses, skirts, and waists	do	do	\$1.50 per pound	\$596,117	397,451	7,949
Other cotton clothing	do	do	\$1.25 per pound	\$1,310,938	1,048,750	20,975
Other cotton manufactures—						
Handkerchiefs	Dozen	do	75 per cent men's, 0.14; 25 per cent women's, 0.125	213,752	76,433	1,523
Laces, embroideries, and lace window curtains	do	do	\$3 per pound	215,750	71,917	1,438
Woven belting for machinery	Pound	do	\$1.18	424,119	500,460	10,009
Cotton bags	do	do	\$1.17	5,908,325	6,910,401	138,203
Quilts, comforts, counterpanes, and bedspreads	Number	do	\$4.00	184,863	739,452	14,789
Bed sheets, pillow, bolster, and mattress cases	Dozen	do	\$18.00	36,803	662,454	13,249
Towels, bathmats, and wash cloths	do	do	\$4.00	907,073	3,628,292	72,566
Other cotton manufactures	do	do	(1)	4,686,196		
Absorbent cotton, gauze, and surgical dressing	Pound	do	\$1.10	3,687,623	4,050,385	81,123
Total, cotton products						7,176,823
(2) TOBACCO PRODUCTS						
Stems, trimming, and scrap tobacco	Pound	2 cents per pound	1.0	10,549,278	10,549,278	210,986
Cigarettes	do	do	2.85 pounds per 1,000	8,455,851	24,099,175	481,984
Chewing tobacco, plug, and other	do	do	0.759	3,885,754	2,949,287	58,986
Smoking tobacco	do	do	0.759	1,120,235	850,258	17,005
Other tobacco manufactures	do	do	0.759	197,734	150,080	3,002
Total, tobacco products						771,963

¹ Statistics not available for conversion factor.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and special orders already granted, the gentleman from New York, Mr. CULKIN, may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of special orders, the gentleman from New York, Mr. CULKIN, may address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY OFFICERS RETIREMENT BILL

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, for some five years the House of Representatives had before it what is known as the emergency officers' retirement bill. It passed two years ago and

was vetoed by the President and passed over the President's veto.

I have no apologies to make for having opposed that bill. Yesterday there was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of those who are the beneficiaries of it. I call it to the attention of the House because it will be extremely interesting reading to those enlisted men in your district who have asked for compensation and been denied to find out how generously you have taken care of the emergency officers during the World War. I call it to your attention because it will give you an opportunity for thought and prayerful study. [Applause.]

FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS THE HUDSON RIVER AT TROY, N. Y.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2719) granting the consent of Congress to the superintendent of public works of the State of New York to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River at the southerly extremity of the city of Troy, now on the House Calendar. It is an emergency bridge bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, I understand from the gentleman that this is an emergency matter?

Mr. PARKER. It is.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the superintendent of public works of the State of New York to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Hudson River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the southerly extremity of the city of Troy, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. WILLIAM H. WELCH

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, April 8, at noon there was celebrated at the Memorial Continental Hall in this city the eightieth birthday of Dr. William H. Welch, one of the professors of the Johns Hopkins University Medical School, who, together with Sir William H. Osler, Dr. Howard Kelly, and Doctor Halstead founded this medical school. There was present at the gathering in Continental Hall a vast concourse of friends and admirers of Doctor Welch.

Dr. Livingston Farrand, president of Cornell University, opened the ceremonies, and after making an address in which he outlined the life and work of Doctor Welch, he introduced Dr. Simon Flexner, of the Rockefeller Foundation. Then the Hon. Herbert Hoover, President of the United States, addressed the gathering, eulogizing Doctor Welch and speaking of his friendship for him. The response was made by Doctor Welch himself, who, in his very able and at times humorous way, acknowledged the great tribute paid him on the part of the speakers and by the presence of the vast audience.

At the same time that we were celebrating in Baltimore there were also celebrations in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and other cities of our country, as well as Peking, China; Tokyo, Japan; London; and Paris. There has, perhaps, never been a celebration of any American citizen so universally observed as that of Doctor Welch. I have known Doctor Welch for many years; in fact, he lives only about a block from my home in Baltimore. He is and has been for many years president of the University Club, of which I am a member, and through which I come in frequent contact with this distinguished gentleman.

There are few, if any, men who combine such a universal knowledge upon so many subjects in addition to that of his profession as does Doctor Welch. The educational, the public health, as well as the medical profession have all profited greatly through the life and work of our friend. One of our strongest impressions in the work of Doctor Welch is the great amount of good he has accomplished in preventing disease. He has largely changed the aspect of the medical profession since he came to Baltimore and since the foundation of the Johns Hopkins Medical School. Through the discoveries of Doctor Welch and those of his students we have been relieved of many diseases which harassed humanity and brought about epidemics resulting in widespread sickness and death; his attitude has been to prevent rather than to await contraction and then cure.

Another strong feature particularly noticeable in Doctor Welch is his great love for humanity and his sympathy for and with the efforts of those with whom he is associated; especially do I speak of his interest in young men who are starting out on their life work. My brother, Dr. G. Milton Linthicum, who gave me considerable data in the preparation of this speech, spoke of Doctor Welch as "the first citizen in the scientific world," and this I believe is what the medical men and those who know him best delight in terming him.

Doctor Welch was born in Norfolk, Conn., in 1850, the only son of a family who had been noted for physicians for generations, his father and his grandfather also being doctors. He graduated from Yale in the class of 1870, the second of 150 men. For a short while he taught Latin and Greek in Norwich, N. Y., studied chemistry at Sheffield Scientific School, and graduated in medicine at the College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York (now Columbia University) in 1875. Following this graduation he studied at Strassburg, Leipzig, Vienna, Berlin, and Breslau.

In the laboratory of Cohnheim, the great pathologist of that time, and through the faculty of Breslau University, Doctor Welch was brought in contact with this new science. At that time Pasteur, working in France, and Koch, working in Germany, were delving into the world of the little creatures called germs which cause tuberculosis, diphtheria, scarlet fever, and other deadly maladies. Pasteur was not a physician; Koch, who isolated the organism of tuberculosis, was.

Doctor Welch saw Doctor Koch demonstrate the theory of the cause and spread of anthrax, and was one of a small group of students who shared this experience which was really the birth of the new science which has led to the relief of so many men and women from suffering and death. Following this stimulating experience he returned to America in 1879. Shortly afterwards he was offered a lectureship in pathology at Columbia University, but no laboratory being there at that time he declined. A short time later he accepted an offer of the Bellevue Hospital Medical College with its laboratory. He not only conducted his classes through the day but opened night classes and taught men who had graduated, thus really beginning post-graduate instruction. While at Bellevue the Johns Hopkins University was opened, and Dr. Daniel C. Gilman, the president and my friend, was searching for men to fill the various departments in the school of medicine. A friend of Doctor Gilman was in Europe, part of whose business was to find a man suitable to fill the chair of pathology. In an interview with one high in medical authority, who had worked with Doctor Welch in his earlier life, it was suggested that Dr. William H. Welch, because of his eminent ability, be called to the chair rather than some European.

Thus it was that Doctor Welch became one of the four original members of the faculty of the new medical school of which I have spoken. These four men have been immortalized in portraiture by the artist, John Singer Sargent.

The pathological laboratory under Doctor Welch was opened in 1885; from that time on to the present, not only has he developed through research work of various orders, the great advancement in the study of bacteriology and pathology upon the foundation of which have been laid measures for the protection of the health of the Nation in a practical way in the form of sewer systems, filtration plants, control of milk supply, vaccination for typhoid and various other preventative medical measures, but the greatest amount of success in his life work has been the development of men who have gone out to teach and advance the science with which he is so intimately associated. Such men do we find in Walter Reed and James Carroll, who made the discovery of the cause of yellow fever and sacrificed themselves to this work, the result of which was responsible for making possible the construction of the Panama Canal and removing from our Southern States and South America the scourge of yellow fever.

Dr. Simon Flexner, who discovered a curative serum for spinal meningitis, now the head of the Rockefeller Institute, was a pupil of Doctor Welch for eight years, and such work as he has done is largely attributable to the great impetus and influence obtained through his contract with Doctor Welch.

Aside from his research work, Doctor Welch reorganized and advanced the Maryland Board of Health of which he was a member. He was, perhaps, the most potent influence in the establishment of the School of Hygiene and Public Health, the first institution of its kind in the world. It has devoted itself to the training of men for public-health work and has been a great influence in bringing about better health conditions throughout the United States. As a member of the International Health Board, he made two trips to China for the sole purpose of giving aid to China in the establishment of modern medicine, ultimately leading to the organization of the Peking Union Medical College.

Doctor Welch is best known as a teacher and a leader rather than as a scientific discoverer. A man of broad, deep, general culture, with a most attractive personality. While not having occupied a seat in a legislative body at any time, as is customary in European countries, yet he has doubtless influenced more legislation in health measures than any other one individual in the world. By his sympathetic and appealing personality, he doubtless has influenced more wealth to the endowment of the Johns Hopkins Medical School than anyone.

Among other things, he played a great part in the establishment of the Harriett Lane Hospital for children, the Phipps Tuberculosis Clinic, the Phipps Psychiatric Clinic, and finally the great medical library associated with which is a chair of medical history, the honor of which has been conferred upon Doctor Welch, and for which he was the great influence which brought about its fruition. His long association with Baltimore has made his figure and personality familiar to every citizen.

On occasions of public functions there is no greater "drawing card" than Doctor Welch. His geniality and ease of contact have made for him great friends.

He has been president of the University Club of Baltimore for many years, and there his familiar figure may frequently be seen browsing through its library. A great man whose life has been spent in the scientific world, and of such broad sympathies that he has kept himself in contact with the world's citizens, with his feet on the ground, and thereby has influenced for good not only the medical profession but the laymen as well. He was engaged in the World War, where he did valiant service, and is now a brigadier general of the reserve officers' medical corps. He has not only been honored by the world, but has had conferred upon him the Legion of Honor by the French Republic.

At a dinner to Doctor Welch, on April 2, 1910, Dr. William S. Thayer, of Johns Hopkins, the toastmaster, said:

In the laboratory by his side in the early years worked Sternberg and Councilman and Booker and Halsted and Sewall and Bolton and Nuttall and Mall and Abbott and Williams and Howard and Flexner and Hewetson and Barker and Reed and Cullen and Wright and many others. And what suggestion and encouragement did we all receive from the delightful talks when the "Father," as we lovingly called him—when we didn't call him "Popsy"—passed from desk to desk, and from his words at the meetings of the little medical society in the hospital library. But that inspiration was for no small group of men. One by one these students have carried abroad his spirit and his teachings until there is scarcely a laboratory in this country that does not contain men who owe their success to that which Welch has given them.

How rich already are the fruits of his work!

It is to you, Doctor Welch, that Councilman owes the inspiration that has guided his useful and eminent career.

It was your teachings that led to the able work of Mall and indirectly to the establishment of his department of which we are so justly proud.

It was your student, MacCallum, whose contributions to our knowledge of malaria have been referred to by one of the most eminent students in this field, as the most brilliant since the discovery of the parasite.

Reed, Lazear, and Carroll were all your pupils, and it was with you and your old coworker, Sternberg, that Reed discussed and planned the work which led to the greatest achievement of American medicine—the discovery of the method of transmission of yellow fever.

It is your student, assistant and colleague, Flexner, whose absence to-night we so deeply regret, who presides over that great institution in New York, which the world owes to the generosity of Mr. Rockefeller. What a contrast, Doctor Welch, between that magnificent institution and your little laboratory—its legitimate mother!

It is your student, Flexner, whose noble discovery of a curative serum for cerebrospinal meningitis is saving so many precious lives to-day.

It is to your wisdom and initiative more than to any other one influence that are due any successes of the medical school started under your guidance.

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The many years that I have been honored with Doctor Welch's friendship make it a privilege to join in this day of tribute to him by his friends and by the great scientific societies of our country. Doctor Welch has reached his eightieth year, and a whole Nation joins in good wishes to him.

Doctor Welch is our greatest statesman in the field of public health, and his public service to the Nation well warrants our appreciation of him. With profound knowledge, wide experience and skill in dealing with men, sound judgment, and a vision of the future he has been a great asset to the Nation, and we may fortunately hope that he will continue for many years more to bless mankind with his invaluable leadership.

Our age is marked by two tendencies, the democratic and the scientific. In Doctor Welch and his work we find an expression of the best in both tendencies. He not only represents the spirit of pure science but constantly sees and seizes opportunities to direct its results into service of humankind.

Medicine until modern times was a species of dramatic play upon emotions rather than a science made useful through technology. It combined centuries of experience in trial and error in reactions from many drugs, with a maximum of skill on the part of the practitioner in a kindly art of making the patient feel as hopeful and comfortable as possible while he was dying of the disease, the origin and treatment of which was as yet undiscovered. Providence was made responsible for his fate rather than the bacillus, which should never have been allowed to infect him.

Modern medical practice, however, is based upon a vast background of scientific research and discovery. In the creation of this science, in

the conversion of its principles into technical methods for use in actual practice, in the diffusion of knowledge of these principles and methods, and in the application of them upon a national and world-wide scale, Doctor Welch has played a leading American part. As a research worker in pure science he has made original and valuable discoveries. As a technologist he has devised practical methods of applying pure science. As a teacher he has spread true knowledge and inspiration among thousands. But in organizing and directing research and application of medical knowledge on a wider field of prevention of disease he is among the preeminent few who deserve the title of statesman.

No valuable change in everyday practice of any of the great arts has ever been made that was not preceded by the accretion of basic truths through ardent and painstaking research. This sequence that precedes effective action in medicine is equally important in every field of progress in the modern world. It is not the method of stirred public emotions, with its drama of headlines; it is rather the quiet, patient, powerful, and sure method of nature herself.

Doctor Welch has happily combined in his character and intellect the love of truth and the patient experimental habit of the pure scientist, with the ingenuity of the inventor and the organizing vision and energy of the promoter of sound enterprise—and combines all these things with a worldly wisdom and gracious charm that has made him a leader amongst men.

I know that I express the affection of our countrymen and the esteem of his profession in every country when I convey to him their wishes for many years of continued happiness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear all of the colloquy about the procedure next week. I understand that it is generally agreed that we will take up the veterans' legislation on Tuesday next under the rule reported on yesterday, and have 12 hours of general debate. If we do not finish the bill on Tuesday, which we probably will not, then it will be in order the first thing on Thursday, will it not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. And on Friday and Saturday, and so forth, until the bill is finished?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will be the unfinished business.

Mr. RANKIN. And it will take precedence over any other legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will simply be the unfinished business of the House, privileged to be called up.

Mr. RANKIN. Would it be subject to be superseded by the so-called Williamson bill, which we had here yesterday?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That would be for the House to decide. There will be two unfinished bills.

INVITATION TO VISIT SHENANDOAH VALLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following invitation for the information and convenience of the Members of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 2, 1930.

The Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Permit me to extend to you and the entire membership of the House a cordial invitation to visit the Shenandoah Valley and make a tour through the enchanted buried city—Grand Caverns. Words nor photographs can describe the beauty and mystery of the place. In one of the great palaces the entire membership of both Houses of Congress could convene, giving you some idea of this wonderland. World travelers justly claim the Grand Caverns to be nature's masterpiece of art work and color in stone and really the world's greatest show place.

In connection with our invitation we suggest that Sunday, May 4, would be an ideal day to make the trip, leaving Washington on a special train at 8 a. m., arriving at Grand Caverns at noon, where luncheon will be served, and then the tour through the Grand Caverns. From the entrance you get a bird's-eye view of the southern entrance of the Shenandoah National Park along the Blue Ridge; you will also see the Piedmont and Shenandoah Valleys in their full spring foliage and the great orchards in full bloom, with the Blue Ridge Mountains wooded to the sky line with riot of colors, presenting a picture no mortal artist could match.

Returning over the Blue Ridge, a stop would be made at Charlottesville and side trip to Jefferson's home at Monticello and through the grounds of Virginia's great university, dinner, and board train for Washington, arriving at bedtime.

No other trip would give to the Nation's public servants more than the one outlined, and the citizens of the old mother State who are donating 400,000 acres of land for the Shenandoah Park would be honored to have as its guests Members of Congress. The only expense

involved would be about \$5 per person for railway transportation. It will be my pleasure to entertain you, and I hope you will endeavor to make the trip.

Awaiting the decision of your great body, I beg to remain,
Sincerely yours,

HOLLY STOVER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARBER] for a few moments.

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I feel I would be somewhat remiss in my duty if I did not add one word by way of emphasis to the invitation that has been extended to the membership of the House to make this unusual trip on May 4. I sometimes think, Mr. Speaker, that the debt of gratitude that the Nation owes to the Old Dominion is temporarily forgotten. I take a moment to suggest that on May 4, if you accept this gracious invitation, you will have an opportunity to visit the State that has given seven Presidents to the Nation. [Applause.] More than that, it is not only the mother of Presidents and the mother of statesmen, but I would remind you that it is also the mother of States, because out of the great Northwest Territory, ceded to the Nation by Virginia in the colonial days, it should be remembered that there were carved out of this wilderness empire the States of Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and a large portion of Michigan. So I urge that you ladies and gentlemen come back to see, metaphorically speaking, your mother on May 4.

Our great old State institution, the University of Virginia, so rich in history and tradition, bids you welcome.

We will show you in your travels through the Shenandoah Valley a scene of unsurpassed beauty. You have here your rolling hills, lying between the mountains, standing in their silent majesty as sentinels guarding the glory of this wondrous valley. You will have here panorama after panorama of beautiful rolling hills, watered by hundreds of crystal streams as they find their way back to the sea. You will literally see here your cattle upon a thousand hills.

The Old Dominion will be most happy to welcome the membership of this House on May 4. I have no interest in the particular caverns whose management extends this invitation. Permit me to say that in my district we have seven of these marvelous subterranean cities hidden away in the earth. The Master was in a very kind mood when he built the great valley of Virginia. He could not spread out before us enough of the glory of His handiwork, and so went beneath the surface and there planted these marvelous cities of idyllic beauty and charm. You are invited to one of the greatest of these on May 4, and I hope very much that you may find it convenient to honor the State with your presence. [Applause.]

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the Consent Calendar is in order, and the Clerk will begin at the point in the call where we left off last.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that instead of commencing at the star, we commence at No. 271 of the calendar. I was not here when the calendar was called, and it was passed over without objection.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I am very friendly to the bill the gentleman refers to, but we can not start there now. With due deference to the gentleman from Ohio, to be fair with all, I must object.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, UTAH, AND WYOMING

The first business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 200) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Colorado, Green, Bear or Yampa, the White, San Juan, and Dolores Rivers and all other streams in which such States or any thereof are jointly interested.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMPACTS BETWEEN COLORADO, NEBRASKA, AND WYOMING

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 201) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the North Platte River and other streams in which such States are jointly interested.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest taken in these two bills by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], who is on his sick bed and can not be here, I think it would be well for his colleague [Mr. EATON] to say just a word in extenuation, so to speak, of the action he has taken in reference to this bill.

The first bill makes a division of the waters of the Colorado, Green, Bear or Yampa, the White, San Juan, and Dolores Rivers between the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and the next bill relates to the division of the waters of the North Platte River between the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

Mr. SIMMONS. The second bill affects only the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

Mr. ARENTZ. The gentleman from Nevada could not get in a word edgewise when the first bill was being considered. The gentleman from Colorado asked to pass over the bill affecting the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. That was on the first bill.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my request was made on account of the illness of my colleague from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR]. I think the bill should be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

POLICE FORCE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5713) to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think these bills affecting questions of salaries ought not to come up by unanimous consent, but in a regular way. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PRIZE FIGHTING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9182) to prevent professional prize fighting and to authorize amateur boxing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am not sure that the bill is properly drawn.

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope when it comes up again there will be here a copy of a report of the District Commissioners on this bill and the one to follow it. I think we ought not to be expected to act on these District bills without an expression from them.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I renew the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOPER] that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIMS AND SUITS AGAINST THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9996) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia," approved February 11, 1929.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the bill is not properly before the House, in that it does not meet the requirements of the rule in regard to requirements of the Ramseyer rule pertaining to bills amending existing law.

Mr. GREENWOOD. The gentleman means that it does not conform to the Ramseyer rule?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order inasmuch as the report does not comply with the rule. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9602) to amend the act of Congress approved March 16, 1926, establishing a board of public welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there seems to be no one here to explain this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 599, 600, AND 601 OF SUBCHAPTER 3, CODE OF LAWS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3144) to amend sections 599, 600, and 601 of subchapter 3 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, what is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. STOBBS. Mr. Speaker, replying to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York as to the purpose of this bill, I may say that it passed at the last session of Congress and its purpose is to make it possible for these charitable and educational corporations chartered by the District of Columbia to provide in their by-laws that a quorum of such corporations may consist of less than a majority of the total number of trustees. The reason for that is that many of these charitable and educational corporations desire to have trustees and directors chosen from all over the United States. In order to transact business under the present law they have to have a majority of the trustees present in order to do business.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, the practice seems to be that they want to have window-dressing directorates, which lend respectability, if you please, to the standing of the organization, but many of the trustees and directors decline to take any active part in the activities of the organizations, so that you have organizations that are really conducted by the professional paid workers. I am not referring to any particular organization.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Does not the gentleman think it bad business to allow trustees from different parts of the country to transact business of organizations chartered in the District of Columbia?

Mr. STOBBS. The idea is to have the by-laws provide that a smaller number than a majority shall constitute a quorum. For example, the church that I have the honor to be associated with, the National Memorial Church of the Universalist denomination, desires such a code of by-laws, and I have been asked to be a member of the board of trustees. We can not do any business or transact business as a board of trustees unless we have a majority as a quorum.

Mr. GREENWOOD. If you had an active institution or an effective board, you could transact business, could you not?

Mr. STOBBS. It is not asked to change the law, but to make it possible for a smaller number to constitute a quorum.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I think it is poor policy to allow less than a majority of the board of directors to transact the business of any corporation.

Mr. STOBBS. It is the only way by which national memorial churches, such as the Episcopal Foundation Cathedral, can be handled.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Are they not allowed to have any number of trustees that they want now?

Mr. STOBBS. They can have any number of trustees, but they can not transact business except by a majority.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Then, it is in their control, under existing law, to provide a less number of trustees so that they can have a majority present.

Mr. STOBBS. But as a practical matter that does not work out. I hope the gentleman will not object. This is in behalf of a church.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, the difficulty is that the instance of which the gentleman is speaking and of which he has personal knowledge, is a really meritorious case, but the bill is too broad. It will permit all societies to do that. It may be necessary and expedient in the case of the church mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but it is a very bad precedent to establish by law in a general statute, so that all societies may do the same thing.

Mr. STOBBS. May I answer that by saying that Congress is absolutely opposed to national incorporations.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I have objected to every one of them.

Mr. STOBBS. Therefore the only way any body of national character may be incorporated is to be incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. If that is done, no business can be transacted if a majority of the board is required to constitute a quorum, where the trustees are scattered throughout the country. If the law remains as it is at present, and a majority of the directors or trustees is required to constitute a quorum, it is impossible to transact business. The gentleman knows that all the veteran organizations desire to be incorporated under a national act. That has been impossible. We are all opposed to it. They must come to the District of Columbia and be incorporated to give them a national character.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If they are not here, of what use are they as directors?

Mr. STOBBS. They come here once or twice a year, but they are interested in the general policy of veteran organizations. It applies not only to veteran organizations but to church organizations and many others that can not get any relief unless this bill is passed.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOBBS. I yield.

Mr. GREENWOOD. We are not only providing legislation for the corporation which the gentleman has in mind, but many others, and we are providing that they can transact business where less than a majority will constitute a quorum. Unless the gentleman will agree to strike that part of the bill, I intend to object.

Mr. STOBBS. The present law provides for what the gentleman has said, and the only thing I am trying to secure is an amendment which will allow the by-laws to stipulate that a less number than a majority shall constitute a quorum.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I object to that.

Mr. STOBBS. I hope the gentleman will reserve his objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I object.

UNITED STATES NAVAL DESTROYER AND MARINE BASE, SQUANTUM, MASS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6142) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease the United States naval destroyer and submarine base, Squantum, Mass.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, with notice that I am going to object.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, this is a thoroughly meritorious bill. It concerns a large area on the edge of Boston Harbor bought by the Navy during the war for the construction of submarines and destroyers—732 acres.

The Government built upon that property buildings which cost \$12,700,000. Of the 732 acres which the Navy Department possessed, there has been turned over to the War Department 468 acres for aviation and such purpose as the War Department desires.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREW. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We are all familiar with the history of it. There is one question I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts. How does the gentleman justify taking property valued at \$13,000,000 and leasing it out on an agreement to keep up the property?

Mr. ANDREW. There is not any such proposal. There is no lease in existence to-day.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the gentleman desires to lease it?

Mr. ANDREW. We want to lease the property because it is of no use. The 124 acres which remain, on which buildings are erected, are of no immediate purpose to the Navy.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The bill provides for leasing for a period of 25 years.

Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. At an annual rental, the consideration payable in cash or in the form of repairs, maintenance, and upkeep of such property?

Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is ridiculous.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREW. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As a matter of fact, the Navy Department has already leased this property to a corporation for a period of five years.

Mr. ANDREW. Yes. Which was canceled last year.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Navy Department to enter into negotiations to lease it to some people for a period of 25 years?

Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And that is the entire purpose of the bill?

Mr. ANDREW. That is the only purpose of the bill. The only purpose is to lease it for such length of time as will yield to the Government advantageous terms.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREW. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman will not find that in the bill. That can be done under existing law.

Mr. ANDREW. Only for five years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman accept an amendment to lease it for 25 years under existing law?

Mr. ANDREW. I do not understand what the gentleman means.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I mean exactly what I say.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREW. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. The Navy Department now has a right to lease this property for five years?

Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. With the privilege of extending the lease for an additional 5-year period, and so on?

Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Now, if the bill should pass and a lease for 25 years was made and an emergency occurred, then the damages that would accrue to the lessee corporation would be much larger than it would be if a lease was made under existing law? Is that not true?

Mr. ANDREW. This bill provides that the lease shall be revocable at the discretion of the Secretary, in case of national emergency.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; but the person, corporation, or partnership who leased the property would receive damages?

Mr. ANDREW. There is no provision here of that character.

Mr. COLLINS. But that is the case anyway. It exists as a matter of right.

Mr. ANDREW. The difficulty in leasing these expensive buildings has been that the Government can not lease them advantageously for five years at a time. They are in bad repair; they are deteriorating; it is a continual loss to the Government. The buildings are of no use.

Mr. COLLINS. But they are under lease now?

Mr. ANDREW. They are not under lease now; no, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. They are under lease at this moment for a 2-year period. I secured this information this morning.

Mr. ANDREW. They were under lease, issued in 1927, and the lease was canceled last year because the terms were not complied with.

Mr. COLLINS. In a telephone conversation this morning I was advised that this property was under lease now for a 2-year period of time.

Mr. ANDREW. Some one who informed the gentleman, I think, was mistaken, because they were leased for five years, and the lease was canceled last year.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They did not pay the rent?

Mr. ANDREW. They did not pay the insurance.

Mr. COLLINS. The Navy Department should know whether it is under lease or not.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Perhaps that is the squatter, the gentleman who is going to get the lease?

For all the reasons stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I object, Mr. Speaker.

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A CITIZEN AND A SOLDIER ON H. R. 3547

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 3547, a bill introduced by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on a bill which he has introduced. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend, I submit a discussion of H. R. 3547 in the form of a dialogue:

CITIZEN. I am surprised that an ex-soldier should offer a bill of this kind and that any soldier should attempt to defend it.

SOLDIER. Then you must be amazed at Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, the venerable justice of the Supreme Court, for it was his dissenting opinion in the Schwimmer case which prompted the introduction of this bill.

CITIZEN. Indeed, I am amazed.

JUSTICE HOLMES'S OPINION

SOLDIER. Well, Justice Holmes is a veteran of the Civil War, with three battle wounds as permanent symbols and guaranties of his patriotism. Notwithstanding his own opposition to pacifism, he held that one's opinions on the abolition of war should not debar an applicant from citizenship. And he adds this strong language:

"I would suggest that the Quakers have done their share to make the country what it is, that many citizens agree with the applicant's belief, and that I had not supposed hitherto that we regretted our inability to expel them because they believed more than some of us do in the Sermon on the Mount."

Referring specifically to Madam Schwimmer, whose rejection was the subject of this classic dissenting opinion, he states:

"Surely it can not show lack of attachment to the Constitution that she thinks that it can be improved. I suppose that most intelligent people think that it might be. Her particular improvement looking to the abolition of war seems to me not materially different in its bearing on this case from a wish to establish * * * one term of seven years for the President. To touch a more burning question, only a judge mad with partisanship would exclude because the applicant thought that the eighteenth amendment should be repealed."

THE GRIFFIN BILL

CITIZEN. Well, all that I know about this Griffin bill is that they say it proposes to relieve the citizen from the obligation to defend the Constitution in time of war.

SOLDIER. It does nothing of the kind.

CITIZEN. What does it do, then?

SOLDIER. Now, you are getting down to brass tacks. Your bias against the bill is obviously a snap judgment influenced by the groundless deductions of a few supersensitive patriots who fear that applicants for citizenship are going to be excused from the obligation to defend the Constitution and the laws—nothing is further from its intent. It would be absurd to grant to naturalized citizens a privilege that was not accorded to native citizens.

CITIZEN. I believe that every citizen—native or naturalized—should not only promise to but actually defend the Constitution.

SOLDIER. Right! But "agreeing to defend" is different from the act of defending. A person might swear to defend the Constitution and yet fall down on the test when war comes.

THE TERM "DEFEND"

CITIZEN. But can we defend the Constitution and the laws without bearing arms?

SOLDIER. Yes; in innumerable ways—as nurses, doctors, teachers, as workers on the farm and in the factory—providing the things necessary to carry on the war.

CITIZEN. That's right, now that I think of it. That's why I didn't enlist myself. I had to run my farm to help feed the brave boys at the front.

SOLDIER. And you were probably a "3-minute man" who pepped the boys up to enlist?

CITIZEN. Exactly! I didn't enlist myself, but I stood on the grand stand right next to the chairman of the local draft board when the boys marched away while the band played "Over There." Yes; those were great days and I'll always believe in war.

BELIEF IN WAR

SOLDIER. If that's the case, then you differ from any soldier I ever knew who has suffered the hardships of war. You will find yourself differing from the mothers of the sons whom you, and other patriots like you, sicked on to go to the front and—who never came back! You will find yourself differing from the President of the United States, and also you will find yourself at loggerheads with the actual laws of our country.

CITIZEN. How is that?

THE KELLOGG PEACE PACT

SOLDIER. Did you never hear of the Kellogg peace pact, more precisely known as the General Pact for the Renunciation of War?

CITIZEN. Yes; but what has that to do with the case?

SOLDIER. Simply this: That from the moment the ratification of the Kellogg peace pact was announced by the President of the United States on July 24, 1929, war has been outlawed.

CITIZEN. Yes; but what does it say?

SOLDIER. It's very short. Here it is:

"ARTICLE 1. The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for

the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

"ART. 2. The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

CITIZEN. Yes; but that's only a treaty.

SOLDIER. Yes; but a treaty is the supreme law of the land under clause 2 of Article VI of the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

CITIZEN. Then, according to that, this country, as well as all other countries signing the Kellogg peace pact, are committed against war as a means of settling international differences.

A SLIGHT INCONSISTENCY

SOLDIER. Yes. And do you not think it strange that an individual, citizen or otherwise, should be penalized for agreeing with the policy and the laws of his or her country?

CITIZEN. Yes. It does seem odd. But suppose that we should get into a defensive war, shouldn't every citizen be compelled to do his duty in defending the country?

SOLDIER. Yes; according to his or her qualifications and in the work for which they are best fitted. This country has never called upon women, for instance, to bear arms and engage in battles.

CITIZEN. No; and, thank God, it never will.

SOLDIER. But it has utilized their services in many ways, and valuable aids they were. It has never called upon persons having religious convictions against war to actually bear arms, and yet they, too, have rendered most valuable services in times of war.

CITIZEN. But there are not many of them, are there?

RELIGIOUS BODIES AGAINST WAR

SOLDIER. The World Almanac says that in 1926 there were about 343,000 members of sects in the United States who have conscientious objections to war, divided as follows: Dunkers, 157,000; Friends, 111,000; Mennonites, 75,000. So you see there are quite a number of decent people in these United States who anticipated the Kellogg peace pact long before it was thought of.

CITIZEN. So it would seem.

SOLDIER. Notwithstanding their convictions, it is interesting to note that many of these good people have actually waived their convictions and served in our armies in times of war. For instance, the famous Gen. Nathaniel Greene in our Revolutionary War and Sergeant York in the World War.

CITIZEN. That's news!

THE POINT OF THE BILL

SOLDIER. In short, the point of this bill is that while the probability exists that persons might change their minds it is not necessary to reject otherwise good citizens on the mere question as to what they might or might not do in a remote contingency.

CITIZEN. It would seem so.

SOLDIER. All this bill does is to waive the requirement that a person should answer under oath, at the time of naturalization, just precisely what he or she would do in the event of war.

CITIZEN. And it does not excuse them from serving the country in time of war?

SOLDIER. No. In time of war, as at all other times, every citizen must obey the laws and do his or her duty. What that duty is or what that service shall be can well be left to determination when the event of war happens.

CITIZEN. I guess that's about right. I can now see that if it is made a condition precedent of good citizenship that one must believe in war the next step might be to disfranchise all who do not.

SOLDIER. That would hardly be fair, in view of the law on our statute books outlawing war, would it?

CITIZEN. Hardly.

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6343) to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the establishment of which is authorized by the act approved May 22, 1926 (44 Stats. 616).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the boundary limits of the tract of land in the Great Smoky Mountains in the States of North Carolina and Ten-

nessee, recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in his report of April 14, 1926, for the establishment of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, be, and the same are hereby, extended to include lands adjacent to the east boundary as defined in said report to a line approximately as follows:

From a point on top of the Balsam Mountains at the boundary of Swain and Haywood Counties just north of Black Camp Gap; thence following east the top of the mountain range to Jonathan Knob and Hemphill Bald; thence along top of ridge through Camp Gap to Bent Knee Knob; thence following the main ridge to Cataloochee Creek to a point on the boundary of the area described in report of the Secretary of the Interior of April 14, 1926; and the lands within said boundary extension, or any part thereof, may be accepted on behalf of the United States in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 22, 1926, for inclusion in the area to be known as the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MARINE BAND

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6349) authorizing the attendance of the Marine Band at the Confederate veterans' reunion to be held at Biloxi, Miss. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TRANSPORTATION ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8639) to amend and reenact subdivision (a) of section 209 of the transportation act, 1920.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HOCH. I object.

TRADE-MARKS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2828) to protect trade-marks used in commerce, to authorize the registration of such trade-marks, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not like to object to this bill, but it is almost a code of law in itself.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOPER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Although this bill has passed prior Congresses, I would like to have the matter go over for two weeks, so that I may have an opportunity to further consider the bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GRATUITY TO DEPENDENT RELATIVES OF OFFICERS, ENLISTED MEN, OR NURSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7639) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize payment of six months' death gratuity to dependent relatives of officers, enlisted men, or nurses whose death results from wounds or disease not resulting from their own misconduct," approved May 22, 1928.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill will not cost the Treasury a dollar. It merely provides additional language desired by the Navy Department so that the determination of the fact of dependency shall rest with the Secretary of the Navy and not with the Comptroller General.

The reason for that language is this: That in many cases of deaths in line of duty the Comptroller General has drawn very fine decisions as to just what the dependency actually was. The language inserted in the bill is in addition to existing law. It is the first proviso on page 3:

Provided, That the determination of the fact of dependency in all cases of dependent relatives, of personnel of the Navy or Marine Corps, whether previously designated or not, by the Secretary of Navy, shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

That is all there is to this legislation. It takes from the Comptroller General the right to determine whether a dependency had in fact existed.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It has oftentimes happened, has it not, that an enlisted man or officer designates some one as entitled to the six months' gratuity; the officer or enlisted man dies, and then when the Navy Department seeks to settle with his estate and give it the six months' gratuity, the Comptroller's office says they are not dependent.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is true.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This leaves it entirely within the discretion of the Navy Department to say who is dependent and not the Comptroller General.

Mr. BRITTEN. In addition to what the gentleman has well said it expedites the settlement of that very unimportant account from the Government's viewpoint.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If the gentleman will permit, I am in sympathy with the purpose of the bill. But, gentlemen, after a great deal of trouble, this Congress created the office of the Comptroller General. Now, are we to destroy the purpose of that office? Are we going to cut down his duties and powers by bills of this kind? It seems to me the Comptroller General can pass upon the question of dependency just as well as the Secretary of the Navy or one of his subordinates.

Mr. COLLINS. And he is a disinterested party.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield further, a great many cases have gone to court in view of the fact that the Comptroller General would hold differently from the Navy Department as to what constituted dependency. An officer or enlisted man designates some particular one of his family who is classified by law as a dependent, and then the Comptroller General comes along and says that although you classify this person as a dependent, in my judgment he is not dependent. Then we say let the Navy Department reach the determination and the man reach the determination instead of the comptroller's office.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Let me suggest that the way to correct that condition is to bring in a bill describing exactly who the dependent may be, in the judgment of your committee and the department, and when it comes to the matter of discretion—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The law already does that.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Just a moment. When it comes to a matter of discretion, or when it comes to construing whether or not the law has been followed, you can not take that power away from the Comptroller General; or, rather, it would be very unwise to do that.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion, my thought, and the committee agrees with me—

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman discussing the point of order?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I have reserved a point of order and in order to give the gentleman an opportunity to discuss it, I now make the point of order the bill is not properly before the House in that it is a bill amending existing law and the report does not show the matters omitted or the new matter inserted in the existing law.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is the gentleman going to insist upon his point of order irrespective of what is said?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Of course, the Speaker will decide the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. I shall not argue the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] makes the point of order that the report accompanying the bill (H. R. 7639) does not comply with the so-called Ramseyer rule. The Chair has inspected the report and finds it does not so comply, sustains the point of order, and refers the bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The Clerk will report the next bill on the Consent Calendar.
INDIAN HOMESTEADS ON THE CROW, THE BLACKFEET, AND THE FORT BELKNAP RESERVATIONS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9761) to authorize the issuance of patents in fee for Indian homesteads on the Crow Reservation, the Blackfeet Reservation, and the Fort Belknap Reservation, in the State of Montana, upon written application therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to cause to be issued a patent in

fee simple, upon written application therefor, to any Indian allottee of the Crow, Blackfeet, or Fort Belknap Reservations, in Montana, for land allotted as a homestead and now inalienable, whenever he shall be satisfied that any such allottee is competent and capable of managing his or her affairs, and thereafter all restrictions as to sale, encumbrance, or taxation of said land shall be removed and said land shall not be liable to the satisfaction of any debt contracted prior to issuance of such patent.

SEC. 2. That any Crow, Blackfeet, or Fort Belknap Indian allottee may sell, upon petition, all or part of any land allotted as a homestead, and the heirs of any deceased Fort Belknap allottee may sell all or any part of an inherited homestead: *Provided*, That such sales shall be made only with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBAL FUNDS OF THE YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE OF INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 188) authorizing the use of tribal funds belonging to the Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, in South Dakota to pay expenses and compensation to the members of the tribal business committee for services in connection with their pipe-stone claim.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill a question. I do not think this is a serious matter, but I notice in the joint resolution, in line 4, the amount originally appeared as \$400 and a line has been stricken through that and \$4,000 substituted.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. It should have been \$4,000 in the original drafting of the bill.

Mr. HOOPER. Then that is a mistake; it is not \$400?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. No; \$4,000.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations. How many members were on this committee?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. I am not able to say; but it was a business committee appointed at a meeting of this tribe on August 23, 1924.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I suppose they were the politicians of the tribe?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Well, I do not know. They were the ones who had in hand the matter of securing this claim. They are the ones the tribe selected to gather the evidence and prosecute the claim.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. They came to Washington, did they?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes; they came here, and they also gathered evidence elsewhere.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Were there more than four of them?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes; I think there were some six or eight, as I recall, although my memory on that is not clear at this time. It was the business committee selected by the tribe for this purpose.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Four thousand dollars is a lot of money to give a voluntary commission. There was nothing of this kind in contemplation at the time.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Let me say that this matter extended over a number of years, and it was largely due to their activity that the claim was approved, and the department held out of the distribution this \$4,000 as a reasonable amount to cover their expenses and the fees, but felt it could not pay this over to this committee without authority to do so from the Congress.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Did the tribe get the \$328,558.90?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I suppose it was not paid to them, but went into the tribal funds?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. No; I think distribution has been made and this \$4,000 was retained at that time by the commissioner.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And the tribe is satisfied with this arrangement?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes. So far as I have been advised and informed, this meets with their approval.

Mr. HOOPER. As I understand, there was a considerable amount actually paid out of the tribal fund for the expenses about which the gentleman has spoken?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Not to this committee. My understanding is they have not been paid anything.

Mr. HOOPER. They have not received anything at all?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. That is my understanding; and this \$4,000 includes their expenses.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. What was the amount of the judgment in the Court of Claims?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. The original claim as found, I think, was something over \$100,000, but when the settlement was made it all amounted to \$328,558.90.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. What were these Indians, who are to receive the benefit of this bill, doing down here, lobbying?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. That I really do not know. They were here and doing the same as anyone who is prosecuting a claim—gathering evidence and presenting it to their attorney and getting it in shape to present to the court.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know whether the attorneys who received attorneys' fees by reason of their services in this claim before the court brought these Indians to Washington? If so, why should not the attorneys pay their expenses?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. No; that was not the case. This business committee was appointed by the tribe at a meeting on August 23, 1924; to take up the matter of the prosecution of this claim, which had been pending for many years. I presume they are the ones who engaged attorneys and looked after the details of the prosecution, the same as any other client would do.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is absolutely certain that the tribe had directed these Indians, who are the beneficiaries under this bill, to come down to Washington and represent the tribe, and that they did not come here voluntarily, and then after the claim went through request compensation?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. No; they had a meeting of the tribe down at Greenwood in August, 1924, and these men were selected as a business committee to take charge of the case, secure legislation submitting the claim to the court, and follow up the claim through the court. I believe they also gave the matter attention after the court had passed on the case in the way of securing the proper appropriation, but especially they were to gather the evidence necessary to sustain the claim.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. And the amount in the bill covers the actual expenses only.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Expenses and compensation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to use not to exceed \$400 of the tribal funds standing to the credit of the Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, in the State of South Dakota, in the Treasury of the United States arising from a judgment of the Court of Claims on claim No. D-546, known as the pipestone claim, decided April 16, 1928, to pay the expenses and compensation of the members of their tribal business committee on a quantum meruit basis for service rendered the tribe and expenses in connection with the prosecution of said claim No. D-546 in pursuance of the action taken by the general tribal council held by the tribe at Greenwood, S. Dak., on August 23, 1924, by authority of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, whereby the said tribal business committee was created and members duly appointed to serve thereon to carry out the wishes of the tribe.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the figures "\$400" and insert "\$4,000."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "committee," insert "or their heirs."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLECTION OF FEES FOR WORK DONE FOR THE BENEFIT OF INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10627) to amend the act of February 14, 1920, authorizing and directing the collection of fees for work done for the benefit of Indians.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the item contained in the act approved February 14, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 415; U. S. C., title 25, sec. 413), authorizing and directing the collection of fees to cover the cost of certain specified work performed for the benefit of Indians, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to collect reasonable fees to cover the cost of any and all work per-

formed for Indian tribes or for individual Indians, to be paid by vendees, lessees, or assignees, or deducted from the proceeds of sales, leases, or other sources of revenue: *Provided*, That the amounts so collected shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except when the expenses of the work are paid from Indian tribal funds, in which event they shall be credited to such funds: *Provided further*, That where fees for work paid for from Indian tribal funds have heretofore been collected and deposited as miscellaneous receipts under the said act of February 14, 1920, the amounts thereof are hereby authorized to be appropriated and credited on the books of the Treasury to the funds charged with the cost of the work."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF TIDELANDS AT FORT LEWIS, WASH.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3311) to authorize the acquisition of certain tidelands for sewer purposes at Fort Lewis, Wash.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARBOUR, Mr. LAGUARDIA, and Mr. CRAMTON objected.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE USE OF THE U. S. S. "OLYMPIA" AS A MEMORIAL

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10296) to provide for the use of the U. S. S. *Olympia* as a memorial to the men and women who served the United States in the war with Spain.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I object.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Last summer a board of officers of the Navy ordered this historical vessel junked. A nationwide protest from Spanish War veterans resulted.

I telegraphed the Secretary of the Navy at the request of the Spanish War organization in my city, and the Secretary said that he would withhold action to see whether or not Congress desired to preserve the ship. The ship, as the gentleman knows, was the flagship of Admiral Dewey at the Battle of Manila Bay, and is a historical vessel. Every Spanish War organization in the country has indorsed by resolution this bill to save the ship. The bill carries an appropriation of \$25,000. The purpose is to use the ship as a memorial in the city of Washington to the men who served in the Spanish War. If it was proposed to construct a memorial to those who served in the war with Spain it would cost several million dollars, and there would be no objection to such a measure. Here is an opportunity to save the Government money and have a suitable memorial. This is to cost \$25,000, and we ask for the \$25,000 to paint and get the ship here, and a small amount for maintaining it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has another bill on the calendar, a very good bill. The gentleman is industrious. His bill pertains to public lands for the veterans and is an excellent bill, and I am with it on that. But, the gentleman recognizes, of course, that this will cost \$25,000 to paint the vessel and tow her here. It will cost half a million dollars to recondition her, and it will take a personnel of 10 or 12 men to keep the vessel in good shape. You can not leave a vessel without any care.

Now, we have on the floor a great naval expert, in the person of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], who will corroborate this. This ship would serve no scientific purpose. It is not a large ship, and it does not justify the cost of maintenance.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I have talked with experts of the Navy Department and they told me they can scrape the bottom for \$2,500 and paint the ship for \$5,000, and that is all it is necessary to do. The ship is now in first-class condition for the purpose for which it is to be used. The Spanish War veterans are going to hold services on it in the Philadelphia Navy Yard on the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*. It will not cost a nickel to recondition it because there is no use in reconditioning it.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman says that I am an expert, and I am going to try and prove it.

The question before the House is as to whether we are going to preserve this historic ship. The most interesting features of Paris, Berlin, London, of all of the old cities of the Old World are their historic monuments and relics. To bring the *Olympia* to Washington, where the school children from this area and visitors from all over the United States can see it, is worth a thousand times more than the paltry \$20,000 or \$25,000 that is authorized under this bill. It will not cost anything like that to

bring the ship here and to paint and scrape it. As to reconditioning, it will not be reconditioned; it will be kept clean, and left as it is. It should be preserved. We ought to keep it for a hundred years, or a thousand years, for those that come after us—for the Spanish-American War veterans and their children and their grandchildren to look at. It is the preservation of an historic relic, and the expenditure of \$25,000 is nothing for so important a cause. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Secretary of the Navy says that after the vessel has been located a force of 10 or 12 men will probably be required for cleaning and watchmen, and the cost of that would, according to the bill, be borne by the Office of the Public Buildings and Public Parks.

Mr. BRITTEN. It may take four or five men. They will be enlisted personnel, and they will be around there working just as they are around obsolete ships at the navy yard. As far as the appropriation is concerned, the House will never hear of it, if the Navy takes care of it. The bill provides that the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Parks may have charge of it. I think it is a good bill, and I hope that the gentleman will not insist upon his objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would the gentleman prefer to have it go over without prejudice?

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to have the gentleman withdraw his objection.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I prefer, if the gentleman is going to ask that the bill go over, that the gentleman object, because it will require three objectors next time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Missouri, I object.

SALARIES OF NAVAL ACADEMY BAND

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10380) adjusting the salaries of the Naval Academy Band.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall object unless some explanation is made of it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman permit me to make an explanation of the bill, so that his objection may be removed?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have an objection which I do not think the gentleman can remove.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have another one also.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, let us take one at a time. Will the gentleman from Michigan withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am simply trying to conserve the time of the House. If the gentleman desires, I shall reserve the objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the author of this bill, Mr. GAMBRILL, of Maryland, is unavoidably absent to-day on account of the death and funeral of his father. Being quite familiar with the bill, I consented to explain any objections that might arise.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is one that is definite with me. We have a joint committee studying the pay of the Army and the Navy and of other services. Why should we be fooling along here piecemeal with certain members of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am glad the gentleman raised that question, because his statement is not applicable at all. This bill has no relation whatsoever to, nor does it interfere with, the prerogatives of the joint pay bill. I grant you that if it did I would say, let the joint pay committee settle the question of compensation and not take it up in this way.

What does this bill do? It merely assigns a rating to the Naval Academy Band. What does the joint pay bill do? It makes the basis of compensation according to the rating, and so the joint-pay committee would have no jurisdiction over this matter at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it not possible that the joint committee may want to give some consideration to ratings as well as to terms of pay?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it would require a repeal by the joint-pay committee of two acts of Congress.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would be all right, if it saves money.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But there is no assurance that it will save money. Before the joint-pay committee can consider the Naval Academy Band, you must repeal the act of 1919 or the act of 1925.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is no one in the Army and the Navy getting pay who does not get it because of some existing law. I will either consent to this bill being passed over without prejudice or object to it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, when a gentleman makes an objection, he is usually willing for any Member on the floor to endeavor to satisfy his objection and show that it is not well founded. I am satisfied the gentleman from Michigan is broad-minded enough, if I can demonstrate his objection is not meritorious, not to insist on it. The joint-pay committee deals with the question of compensation, and not with the question of rating.

Mr. CRAMTON. I shall be disappointed as one Member, if that committee permits itself to be hedged about by such technicalities as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. All right. I know no better answer than to state that that is exactly what happened to the 1922 pay bill. What happened to the 1922 pay bill when we had a joint pay bill was that they did not even take it into consideration.

Mr. JENKINS. What is the reason why the Navy Department opposes this?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I suppose they do not want these musicians to receive a higher rate of pay. The Naval Academy band was created by special act of Congress in 1919. That act designated a certain number of first-class musicians and a certain number of second-class musicians. The Navy Department does not insist that the band must be made up of musicians of the first class and second class. The purpose is to repeal the act of 1919 and put it in the discretion of the department to determine how many musicians shall be put in these different classes. The Navy Department can increase or decrease the number in the Navy Band, but can not do it in the case of the Naval Academy Band. For that reason the pay bill will not touch this matter at all. It did not touch it in 1922, and it will not now, because in order to touch it you must repeal the act of 1919 and the act of 1922.

Mr. CRAMTON. The only way that the joint committee can accomplish anything as to the Army and Navy pay is to consider the various statutes fixing the rates of pay. They will have to recommend amendments to the law in proposing any change. The report of the committee on this bill says:

If this bill becomes a law, the complement and pay of the Naval Academy Band will be substantially the same as the Navy Band, and the increased cost to the Government will be between ten and eleven thousand dollars.

That statement makes it clear that the purpose of this bill is to fix the pay, whether you do it through the means of changing the pay of these men or changing the rating. Whatever naval technicalities you resort to, it is to change the pay.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has just read a statement from the report regarding the purpose of the bill, to permit the Navy Department to change the complement.

Mr. CRAMTON. It says, "If this bill becomes a law, the complement"—I suppose that means the number; it is not a compliment to their musical ability?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No.

Mr. CRAMTON. It provides that the pay shall be substantially as that of the Navy Band.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under the act of 1919 the Navy Department can not do that, because the act of 1919, creating the band, says there must be 45 first-class musicians and 27 second-class musicians. There is no assurance by the passage of this law that the Naval Academy Band will cost more than it is costing to-day, or that the men will get more money.

Mr. CRAMTON. They might cut it in two and reduce the number; but, knowing the Navy, I do not think that will happen.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is a great deal of reduction taking place in the Navy to-day.

Mr. CRAMTON. So far as this statute is concerned, if the committee is studying the pay of the Army and Navy and trying to adjust inequalities that exist—and there may be inequalities—in their effort to adjust inequalities they will recommend a change in the law of 1919.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman think that they are going to come back here with a report repealing the organic law? It can not say it will reduce the number of the Coast Guard or any other organization, but it can fix the pay.

Mr. CRAMTON. The report says that if this bill becomes a law the pay of the Naval Academy Band will be substantially that of the Navy Band.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The joint committee can not fix the complement.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not talking about the complement. The committee reported that if this bill becomes a law the pay of the Naval Academy Band will be substantially the same as the Navy Band.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The pay can not be substantially the same as that of the Navy Band unless you change the as-

signments. Suppose this joint committee had the right to consider the compensation of Members of Congress. Do you think they could go into the question of how many Members of Congress shall be here? Their jurisdiction is as to compensation and not complement. You have first got to have the proper complement, and the bill is entirely one of assignment and not of pay.

Mr. CRAMTON. What would the gentleman say to striking out of this bill everything but that they can have as many musicians as the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe? That would take care of the complement.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. A subcommittee was appointed, and that subcommittee made an investigation. The subcommittee included the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] and others, and they worked together; and we think that the bill as now drafted does justice to the Naval Academy Band by giving them a new assignment, not dealing with the question of pay.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], whose judgment I always follow in matters of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior, that this band is just as much a part of the faculty as any professional man there. This band works more than any band in the service, I believe. In fact, they are split up into three parts in the mornings for the various drills. It is impossible to get musicians to remain in the service at the present pay. The gentleman from Michigan will recall that some years ago there was a great deal of trouble because the musicians at Annapolis were engaging in trades just outside of the reservation. That was prohibited by law. We must have a band at Annapolis. The pay of the band will not be reached by the joint pay committee which is studying the pay of commissioned officers.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true. These men are enlisted men. Not a single man here is an officer. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has brought up a very important question.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does either gentleman assert that these enlisted men are considered as a part of the faculty of the Naval Academy?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Well, the faculty can not get along without them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They are enlisted men. Every one is a warrant officer, and he may be assigned anywhere.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] say that music is not a cultural part of the education of a young officer of the United States Navy?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is highly desirable, but not everyone who contributes to the education and development of the young midshipman is considered a member of the faculty.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under the law to-day, a member that is assigned to the Navy Band may be ordered by the Bureau of Navigation to any place in the service. In view of the law of 1919 the Navy Department can not order one of the enlisted men who has been assigned to the Naval Academy Band to any other place except that one place. That is one great advantage of getting away from this hard, fixed rule, and having some elasticity in the law.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I think it would be better to give them more pay.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not asking for pay. I am asking for the proper rating, and then the joint pay committee can discuss that question when it considers it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will not this bill give them more pay?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course not. It gives them the proper assignment, and then the assignment takes care of the pay.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The men are already in the service.

Mr. CRAMTON. What would the gentleman from Georgia think of the substitute which I have offered for his bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope the gentleman will not offer any substitute, because I would like to see this band put upon an equality with the band in Washington.

Mr. CRAMTON. When the Board of Visitors of which my friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] may be a member at any time, goes to Annapolis and the band turns out to meet it, I hope it will be a good big band, and therefore I propose, as a substitute, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Naval Academy Band shall hereafter consist of one leader, one second leader, and of such enlisted men as may be assigned to that band by the Navy Department.

That will give the Secretary of the Navy authority to make just as large a band as he thinks ought to be proper for the arrival of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is placing me in an embarrassing position. If the gentleman will withdraw his objection, then I will not object to him offering it on the floor, but, of course, I would have to oppose his amendment. If the gentleman from Michigan feels there is something in the amendment, the committee will take up the amendment if the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. I fear that the influence of the gentleman from Georgia, together with the assistance of my friend from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], might make it difficult to get away from this pay bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman does not have to bring up any such proposition as this.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have in my hand the joint resolution which was passed by this Congress, and it deals with a tremendously important subject, the pay of the Army and Navy, and as far as I am concerned while that committee is at work I am not going to permit any legislation to pass which either directly or indirectly changes the pay of the members of the Army or Navy establishments.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. That resolution provides that—

A joint committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the Vice President, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall make an investigation and report recommendations by bill or otherwise to their respective Houses relative to the readjustment of the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the several services mentioned in the title of this joint resolution.

Now, whatever should be done with reference to pay I think can wait until that joint committee completes its work. Therefore I am obliged to object.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will withhold my objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I would like to ask, as a matter of information, what is the difference in pay between an enlisted man and a man who is in the band?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It all depends upon his rating. Of course, an enlisted man begins as a seaman, first class, and he receives so much. After being in the service he may become a warrant officer and be eligible for assignment to the band. It depends entirely upon the rating received.

Mr. GREENWOOD. He does get additional pay for being in the band?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He gets the rating of that class. If he is a warrant officer, first class, he gets the pay of a warrant officer, first class. He does not get any additional compensation because he is in the band.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Is he elevated to this class because he is in the band?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. One of the suggestions made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] is that this joint commission will study the pay of the entire Army and Navy. We, however, have only one Naval Academy Band. This situation is comparable only to the band at the Military Academy at West Point, and we have already taken care of that. So that in all likelihood they will be forgotten and they will be entirely out of the picture when the report of the joint pay commission is submitted to Congress.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BURTNESS. The gentleman has referred to a matter that I wanted to inquire about. How does the situation at the Naval Academy compare with the situation at the Military Academy at this time? Surely they should be comparable.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I imagine that the injustice that is so apparent in the Navy Band does not exist in the Army, but I can not speak of that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like to submit another reason for objecting.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will state to the gentleman that he does not have to offer to the House any reason why he objects. He has a right to object any time he pleases.

Mr. CRAMTON. But I have another objection for the gentleman to shoot at. If the President is going to succeed in his effort to keep down expenditures, the Budget system must amount to something. I imagine there are a dozen bills on this Consent Calendar coming from the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which not more than one or two are recommended to Congress by the department.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I ask the gentleman from Michigan to point them out.

Mr. CRAMTON. The bill under consideration is not recommended by the department.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. For the reason that the Budget advises against it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. CRAMTON. The next one is exactly in the same position. No. 299 is the one we have before us. No. 300, by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], is likewise not recommended by the department or the Budget. No. 301 is not recommended by the department or the Budget. I think that No. 302, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia, is not recommended by the department or the Budget. I have not taken a complete census, but inasmuch as I ran onto four or five, one after another, none of them recommended by the Budget, I concluded that the Committee on Naval Affairs has no sympathy with the Budget system.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The members of the Committee on Naval Affairs believe they know as much about these bills as the Budget.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will not dispute that; but I will say the Budget must have some weight if we are to have Federal economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

RETIREMENT OF DISABLED NURSES IN THE NAVY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10375) to provide for the retirement of disabled nurses in the Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to know how the provisions for the retirement of these Navy nurses compare with the provisions made for other nonmilitary employees of the Government?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I do not know that there is anything comparable to it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How does the gentleman justify taking these employees and providing that if they are disabled in line of duty they shall then and there be retired on three-fourths pay and allowances, while if an employee of the Post Office Department is crushed by a mail truck and his case goes before the Employees' Compensation Bureau, he does not receive anything like three-fourths of his pay.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I think the circumstances are entirely different. A Navy nurse is not a civilian employee. A Navy nurse, as every Member of this House ought to know, is subject to all the hazards of her profession here and elsewhere.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. So is every other employee.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I have reference to things other than those met with by civilian employees of the Government. For instance, a Navy nurse finds it necessary at times to do duty in the Tropics; she finds it necessary to serve aboard hospital ships and transports at sea. Before she can be appointed as a member of the Navy Nurse Corps she is given a very careful and a very thorough physical examination. This examination is so very rigid that comparatively few are successful in passing it. Everyone will agree, I think, that the Government should be given this protection. After her appointment she serves for three years at \$70 per month, or approximately \$2.33 per day. Nurses serving in a civilian capacity make anywhere from \$6.50 to \$10 per day.

The Navy nurse works for less than one-half what the civilian receives. In addition she gets her quarters. That is all she gets beyond what a civilian nurse receives as a daily or weekly stipend.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. She gets permanent employment.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; but a good civilian nurse has no difficulty whatsoever in finding all the employment she wants, and when she is so employed she receives more than twice as much as the Navy nurse.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman should not make it as broad as that. She gets retirement and she gets permanent employment.

Mr. WOODRUFF. She only receives retirement after at least 20 years' service, and, as I have said before, she comes into the service at pay far below that which she could get as a civilian nurse. What happens to her in case she is disabled by reason of her service? Certainly she has not been able to lay aside enough money from her meager salary upon which to live. She does have a pensionable status, which would, probably, pay her not to exceed \$30 per month. Does any Member of this House believe that a nurse or any woman can live in any way comfortably on \$30 per month?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; neither can an employee of the Post Office Department.

Mr. WOODRUFF. On the other hand, an employee of the Post Office Department is not subject to the same hazards of employment that a nurse in the Navy is subjected to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would not say that.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; the gentleman would if he would be fair.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do not quarrel with me, because I am not going to object.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, because I am going to object, the Secretary of the Navy reports adversely against this bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF. No. The Secretary of the Navy, I think, makes no report on it.

Mr. COLLINS. The committee report states that he recommends against the enactment of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That is all right, but in the same report, if the gentleman will scan it carefully, he suggests to the Naval Affairs Committee that if they propose to act favorably on the bill that he be permitted to give us an outline of the bill which he thinks should be adopted. The bill now before the House is the bill suggested by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. COLLINS. In addition, the Secretary of the Navy suggests that the enactment of this bill will cost additional money. In addition he adds this statement:

Had this legislation been in effect in all probability there would have been additional retirements for physical disability.

In other words, if this had been the law we would have had more on the retired list than we have now.

Mr. WOODRUFF. No; because, as I understand it, we have no nurses on the retired list at the present time for physical disability.

Mr. COLLINS. Then the Secretary of the Navy is wrong in his statement.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am telling the gentleman what the facts are, and if he will examine the hearings he will find I am speaking with full knowledge of the facts.

Mr. COLLINS. I am quoting from a letter to the Committee on Naval Affairs from the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I understand that; and let me say to the gentleman that the members of the Naval Affairs Committee could not understand just how the Navy Department arrived at its conclusion, because these are the facts.

Mr. COLLINS. In other words, the Secretary of the Navy does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am stating he did not know what he was talking about in this instance, and I am going to tell the gentleman why. If he will scan the hearings, he will find testimony from several high ranking officers of the Navy to the effect that at the present time nurses who are disabled in line of duty are not retired. There are a number of these unfortunate women scattered about the country in the several Navy hospitals. Three or four suffering from tuberculosis are in the Denver hospital; one in Washington, one in Philadelphia, and others in other hospitals. To the everlasting credit of the Navy Department I will say that they are kept on the pay roll in hospitals under treatment at full pay, and it must be apparent that if the law and the conditions were such that these nurses could be retired on three-fourths pay, we would be saving at least one-fourth of the money we are paying them now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I will be very pleased to yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman stated there is no retirement feature granted to the nurses of the Navy to-day.

Mr. WOODRUFF. For disability, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read the law, after they have served 30 years or reached the age of 50, having served 20 years, then they have the retirement privilege.

Mr. WOODRUFF. But not for disability. That is retirement for service. They can retire at any time after they reach the age of 50, provided they have served 20 years.

Mr. STAFFORD. And they have a pensionable status prior to reaching the age of 50?

Mr. WOODRUFF. A very modest one at all times. They can secure a pension, but it is so utterly inadequate for their needs that it is unthinkable the Navy would under present conditions dismiss them because of disability.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am referring to their retired pay after 30 years of service.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; they can secure not more than 75 per cent of their pay.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. How does the law applicable to the Navy nurses compare with the law applicable to Army nurses?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Under the law as it is at present they are on exactly the same status.

Mr. COLLINS. Another objection I have to the bill is that it is a bill carrying an increase in pay, and it should be considered by the joint committee on pay for these two services.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I do not think it is. In my opinion, it is simply giving to this very splendid body of women—

Mr. COLLINS. An increase in pay.

Mr. WOODRUFF (continuing). A measure of justice they are entitled to and some inducement to come into the nursing service of the Navy and stay there. There is nothing in the bill which changes the pay status as provided by existing law. I wonder if the gentleman understands and realizes how difficult it is to-day to secure the requisite number of nurses for the Navy. There has not been a time in the last five years when we have had all the nurses in the Navy we are supposed to have, simply because of the fact it is difficult to get them into this service. It must not be forgotten that this bill gives nothing to the nurse who voluntarily leaves the service. In order to receive the benefits of it she must be disabled in line of duty.

Mr. COLLINS. I understand you have around 300 applicants.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And out of that 300 we would perhaps secure 30 or 40. We are right now below what we should have in the Navy. There are 520 nurses authorized, and there are now in the corps 507, I believe.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

HOSPITALIZATION—FLEET NAVAL RESERVE AND FLEET MARINE CORPS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10662) providing for hospitalization and medical treatment of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in Government hospitals, without expense to the reservist.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is another bill that is in harmony with the general policy of the Naval Affairs Committee of disregarding the Budget. It is true the Secretary of the Navy makes a report from which one might infer that the Navy is in favor of the bill, and then concludes with the statement that it was referred to the Budget and the Budget recommended against its enactment, and hence the department does not make a recommendation.

I do not care so much about any of these little bills, but I am concerned with whether our Budget system is going to be shot full of holes by the Navy Department. If the administration will permit the submission of these reports—that I will not call hypocritical, but reports that are at least ingenious, going as far as they can in manifesting approval without saying in so many words that they approve of the bill—if the administration is going to permit any department to indulge in this kind of pastime, a kind of blindman's buff game with the Budget, you are going to ruin the Budget system. I submit that the Navy Department ought not to have any privileges that any other department does not have. If the Navy Department can make this kind of very smooth and adroit report indicating approval without saying so, the other departments not only will have the right but they will be alert enough to adopt the policy, and then you might as well throw your Budget in the discard.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And if the gentleman will permit, the Navy Department indulges in that more than any other department.

Mr. CRAMTON. The Navy Department does it more than any other, unless it is the Army. [Laughter.]

Mr. EVANS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. EVANS of California. Since the Navy Department's letter was written to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, a very substantial part of the expense that would be incurred by the passage of this bill has been eliminated by cutting out of the bill the refund feature.

Mr. JENKINS. If the gentleman will permit right there, is that the difference between the bill H. R. 2944 and the present bill?

Mr. EVANS of California. Exactly.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I ask why the committee has done that?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Michigan has criticized the Navy Department and the Army for overriding the Budget. Is it not a fact that the Navy got into that habit due to the policy oftentimes practiced by the Appropriation Committee by making appropriations for unexpended balances and overriding the Budget? When the gentleman comes to criticize any department for overriding the Budget he must bear in mind that the gentleman's own committee has been guilty of the same practice.

Mr. CRAMTON. The only difference between the gentleman and myself is that my statement is in accordance with the facts whereas his statement is not in accordance with the facts; otherwise we are in agreement. [Laughter.] I will say this: The gentleman may refer to the subcommittee with reference to naval appropriations, but I am sure that he would never make the charge against the subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriations. And let me say for the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Navy Department that it is entitled to the full sympathy for when it takes the job of trying to hold down the demands of the Army and the Navy it may have to resort to extreme measures.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not criticizing the subcommittee.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. BURTNESS. I would like to ask the gentleman a serious question: Where a department is in favor of legislation which they may have worked for and desired for a number of years, and in which they are interested in getting legislation of that type, and in the regular course of legislation they find that the Bureau of the Budget is opposed to it for financial reasons—where the department actually wants it and where it is confronted by the Bureau of the Budget, just what sort of a report should the department make to a congressional committee that would be fair to all parties?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman that what will have to be done if the Budget means anything, that it should be remembered that the Commissioner of the Budget is the right hand of the President. He is supposed to be carrying out the policy of the President with reference to appropriations.

The Secretary of Navy and the Secretary of War and every other Cabinet officer is also an aide to the President, and is supposed to be carrying out the administration's policy. When a Cabinet officer ceases to support the President in his financial policy the administration will be demoralized and the Budget system will cease to be of any value.

Hence the Secretary of the Navy can report that the matter has been discussed with the Budget and the Budget renders an adverse report; they can go further and present the facts as to what the bill is and what it does without the phrases that they so adroitly put in.

Mr. BURTNESS. If the department is favorable to the legislation except for the fact that the Bureau of the Budget is against it for financial reasons, and Congress asks for a report, is it not entitled to the facts from the department on the general merits?

Mr. CRAMTON. If this kind of a report continues you will have the Budget system shot full of holes.

Now, I would like an answer to the question I asked, why the committee did make the change referred to?

Mr. EVANS of California. In the hearings the gentleman has observed in reference to this that Admiral Leigh, representing the Navy Department, appeared before the committee and states unequivocally that he is in favor of this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman does not answer my question.

Mr. EVANS of California. What is it?

Mr. CRAMTON. Why did the committee make the change?

Mr. EVANS of California. Because the committee was not in favor of the refund feature of the bill.

This bill was introduced originally by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] when he was a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. It was considered at length by the committee and unanimously approved after the gentleman from New Jersey ceased to be a member of that committee. He is entitled to the credit for introducing the legislation; I am not, although my name happens to appear as the author of the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. What became of H. R. 2944 in the Seventieth Congress?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2944 was introduced, as the gentleman from California [Mr. EVANS] has stated, by me while I was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. After the introduction of that bill on May 14, 1929, the opinion of the Navy Department concerning the provisions of the bill was requested by the committee. The letter of January 14, 1930, which appears in the committee report accompanying H. R. 10662, and which is now under consideration, is in answer to the request of the committee, and refers to H. R. 2944, which was introduced, as already stated, by me. The report of the Navy Department contained in the letter which I have referred to indicates that the Bureau of the Budget had advised the Navy Department that the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the financial program of the President. This evidently refers to that portion of H. R. 2944 which provides a refund to the beneficiaries of the bill for subsistence already deducted. The Committee on Naval Affairs has undoubtedly given careful consideration to this feature of the bill and has considered that, in view of the objection, it might be well to eliminate that portion of the measure.

However, whether this be the exact reason or not, the fact is that on March 12, 1930, Mr. EVANS, a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, introduced H. R. 10662, which is identical with the bill introduced by myself, except the retroactive feature.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the hospitalization of retired men of the Navy and Marine Corps and transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve without deduction for hospital rations from their pay.

The very carefully prepared report of the committee in this matter informs us that:

At present hospitalization of all naval personnel is paid for out of the naval hospital fund. This is a trust fund of which the Secretary of the Navy is the sole trustee. It is made up of money drawn from various sources, of which the following are pertinent:

Twenty cents per month deducted from the pay of each officer, seaman, and marine of the Navy, including those on the retired list and those in the reserve.

Ration allowance of one ration per day for each officer, seaman, and marine during his continuance in hospital. The value of the ration for this purpose being provided under appropriation "Provisions, Navy," in the naval appropriation act.

Enlisted personnel on active duty are allowed a ration or commutation thereof in money, and in their case this allowed ration is balanced against the deduction authorized. Retired enlisted men and men of the fleet reserve transferred thereto after 16 or more years' service, however, are required to defray hospital subsistence charges at the rate of 75 cents per diem, which is deducted from their retired or retainer pay.

It is from the necessity of thus further contributing to the hospital fund that the bill H. R. 10662 is designed to relieve them.

I think the merit of this bill can be readily appreciated when it is realized that the average retired pay of those whom the bill seeks to benefit amounts to only \$784.84 per annum; also, that it is an injustice to make any deduction from this small amount for rations when confined in a Government hospital. While I realize that at the present time objection is being made to the bill, yet I am hopeful that a further consideration will be given to it by those objecting, to the end that it may receive favorable action at a subsequent day.

Mr. EVANS of California. The reservists who will be benefited by this legislation have been paying into this fund 20 cents per month for 20 years, and it is for the purpose of enabling them to receive the benefit from this fund which they created themselves, that this legislation is proposed.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PAYMENT OF DEATH GRATUITY—FLEET NAVAL RESERVE AND FLEET MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10674) authorizing payment of six months' death gratuity to beneficiaries of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who died while on active duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand that there are about 300 of these men in the reserve, employed as ship keepers on laid-up ships. All are on active duty.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the gentleman is approximately correct.

Mr. COLLINS. I have no objection to the bill, providing the gentleman will eliminate the two provisos on page 2.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the retroactive feature should be eliminated, and in view of the policy the committee has adopted to-day to leave the discretion in the Accounting Office, I am willing to accept those two amendments.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is the reason I reserved the objection. It is understood that an amendment striking out the proviso will not be resisted and will be accepted, and that the withdrawal of the reservation is made on that stipulation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is. I will move to strike out the two provisos, and ask the committee to concur in the motion.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the withdrawal of the reservation is under that agreement?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this present bill is also one that I introduced while a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I have no objection to the elimination of that retroactive feature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, which authorized the payment of an amount equal to six months' pay to the beneficiaries of personnel of the regular Navy or Marine Corps, and retired personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, when on active duty, shall be extended to transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who die while on active duty and not as a result of their own misconduct, and transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall be required to file with the Navy Department the name of beneficiary other than wife or child to which payment of the amount equal to six months' pay shall be made in the event of their death while on active duty and not the result of their own misconduct: *Provided*, That the determination of the fact of dependency in all cases of dependent relatives, of personnel of the Fleet Naval Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, whether previously designated or not, by the Secretary of the Navy, shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *Provided further*, That this act shall be retroactive to June 4, 1920.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 2, line 6, strike out the colon, insert a period, and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to and the bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INQUIRIES CONCERNING REGISTERED MAIL, ETC.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5659) to authorize the Postmaster General to charge a fee for inquiries made for patrons concerning registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail, and for postal money orders.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I object.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAPES). Three objections are noted, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

TIME FOR SOLDIERS, SAILORS, ETC., TO ENTER PUBLIC LANDS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 181) to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry," approved February 14, 1920, as amended January 21, 1922, and as extended December 28, 1922.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on page 2, lines 9 and 10, are the words "any war, military occupation, or military expedition." If the gentleman in charge of the bill will agree to strike out "military occupation or military expedition," and will also agree to strike out the pro-

viso beginning with the colon in line 17, I shall have no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. SWING. Does the gentleman state that if those are not stricken out he will object?

Mr. COLLINS. I do.

Mr. SWING. Then I will agree to have them stricken out.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I do not get the purport of the amendment.

Mr. COLLINS. The bill has added military occupation or military expedition. Heretofore these ex-soldiers have been soldiers or sailors of a war. Now it is proposed to add "military occupation or military expedition."

Mr. SWING. Those words will add about one half of 1 per cent to the total number of citizens who will be benefited by the bill.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that he is not going to find a soldier in the Regular Army who is desirous of taking the benefit of this. This means real work.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not think we ought to begin that practice at this late day. The second objection undertakes to state that the war with Spain includes the period from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That takes in the Philippine insurrection.

Mr. SWING. That is what it is intended to cover. It was put in at the request of the representatives of the Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. They were citizen soldiers; they were not professional soldiers at that time.

Mr. COLLINS. If they were soldiers in the war, you do not need this language.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The war was declared at an end and we were then not engaged in warfare with any country. We had taken over the Philippines, but the Philippine insurrection, for the purposes of legislation, has always been included in the war with Spain.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The bill was introduced at the request of the Spanish-American War veterans' organization and that proviso was placed in it.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman accept the amendments I propose?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Is the gentleman going to object unless we do?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Then I accept the amendments, but express the hope the language will be restored in the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry," approved February 14, 1920, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter, for the period of 10 years following the passage of this joint resolution, on the opening of public or Indian lands to entry, or the restoration to entry of public lands theretofore withdrawn from entry, such opening or restoration shall, in the order therefor, provide for a period of not less than 90 days before the general opening of such lands to disposal in which officers, soldiers, sailors, or marines who have served in the Army or Navy of the United States in the war with Germany and been honorably separated or discharged therefrom or placed in the Regular Army or Naval Reserve shall have a preferred right of entry under the homestead or desert land laws, if qualified thereunder, except as against prior existing valid settlement rights and as against preference rights conferred by existing laws or equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation: *Provided further,* That the rights and benefits conferred by this joint resolution shall not extend to any person who, having been drafted for service under the provisions of the selective service act, shall have refused to render such service or to wear the uniform of such service of the United States."

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make any and all regulations necessary to carry into full force and effect the provisions hereof.

With committee amendments as follows:

On page 1, line 5, after the figures "1920," insert "as amended by joint resolution approved January 21, 1922, and as extended by joint resolution approved December 28, 1922."

On page 2, line 1, after the word "following," strike out "the passage of this joint resolution" and insert "February 14, 1930."

On page 2, line 9, strike out "the war with Germany" and insert "any war, military occupation, or military expedition."

On page 2, line 17, after the word "confirmation," insert "*Provided,* That for the purposes of this resolution, the war with Spain shall be considered to include the period from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902: *Provided further,* That the same preference rights are hereby extended to apply to those citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War and who were honorably discharged, upon their resumption of citizenship in the United States, provided the service with the allied armies shall be similar to the service with the Army of the United States for which recognition is granted in this joint resolution."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment to the committee amendments, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS to the committee amendment: Strike out, in line 10, the words "military occupation or military expedition," and on line 17 strike out "*Provided,* That for the purposes of this resolution the war with Spain shall be considered to include the period from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendments.

The amendment to the committee amendments was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments as amended.

The committee amendments as amended were agreed to.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, since the proviso is stricken out it is proper to strike out the word "*further,*" after the word "*Provided,*" on line 20. I move that the word "*further,*" be stricken out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, after the word "States," on line 7, insert: "*Provided,* That the lands known as the Oregon-California land grants shall be subject to said entry, and when filed on the same shall be exempt from taxation by the counties where the same are located."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order on that as not being germane.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that in making an investigation at one of the departments a few days ago I found that this land, although public land and subject to homestead entry, is now being assessed for taxation by various counties in Oregon and possibly one county in California, and that the amount of taxes collected up to the present time is more than \$7,000,000. In other words, the Government is being unjustly penalized because of a law that was passed which was not understood by many Members of Congress, and I think it is time that the matter was brought to the attention of this body.

I am told that a portion of this land was reserved by the Government in order that the same might be used for watersheds in connection with the water supply of some cities in this area. An opinion was written exempting same from assessment, but the Attorney General overruled the opinion, and this portion is not subject to homestead entry unless my amendment should be adopted. Yet the counties are allowed to assess such areas up to as high as \$100 per acre, and the Treasury has to pay on this basis.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe that that is a proper amendment to the bill before the House?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is not at all germane to this bill.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I was told that this was a bill that gave preference rights to certain persons who performed services in our military operations and gave them a right to make homestead entries; therefore it would seem that my amendment would be germane.

Mr. CRAMTON. The general subject of the public-land system is not before the House. This is a proposition as to the rights of soldiers and sailors to homestead entry. That is what is before the House. The gentleman brings in something which, though it has to do with the public lands, has nothing at all to do with the rights of soldiers and sailors in homestead entries. I make a point of order on the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California renew his point of order?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I wanted to conclude a sentence. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I know that a certain portion of this public land has been reserved for certain purposes. I wanted to make these reserves eligible for homestead entry. If what I have offered is not germane to the subject then I am willing that it should go out on a point of order.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, I insist on the point of order.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. I will withhold the point of order.

Mr. COLTON. An amendment is unnecessary. This law will be applicable to these lands.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] is recognized.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a point of order is made against the amendment offered by me on the ground that it is not germane to the bill now under consideration.

I assert that the land I refer to is public land, and public lands, unless there are certain restrictions levied against them, are subject to homestead entry. I have been advised that a portion of this particular area has been withdrawn in order that it might furnish ample protection to certain reservoir systems that now supply cities in that particular area. Therefore I offered the amendment in order that these public lands which now have a temporary withdrawal order levied against them might be eligible for homestead entry, thereby giving to those who are named as a favored class in this legislation the right to make a filing without being bothered by some existing regulation that might prevent them from exercising such a right. I desire that this legislative body should adopt an amendment that would say to this favored class that they have a right to make homestead entry on the lands in this particular area. I have been confidentially advised that President Coolidge, when he signed the bill giving certain counties the right to assess these lands for taxation, did not have any conception of the amount of money that this Government would have to pay in carrying out the provisions of the law. When it is known that they can be homesteaded and paid for at a rate of approximately \$1.25 per acre, and the county authorities are assessing them as high as \$100 per acre, Members of Congress should realize that such favoritism in the way of legislation is not ethical or right. Therefore I am offering this amendment, believing the same to be germane, with the hope that this cruel method of taxing the people of the United States for the purpose of supporting certain counties in Oregon will soon be brought to an end.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma is not germane to this legislation, and therefore sustains the point of order.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to amend a joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry,' approved February 14, 1920, as amended January 21, 1922, and as extended December 28, 1922."

NATIONAL CONVENTION, AMERICAN LEGION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10118), to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Twelfth National Convention of the American Legion, at Boston, Mass., during the month of October, 1930.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized to lend, at his discretion, to the American Legion 1930 Convention Corporation, for use at the Twelfth National Convention of the American Legion to be held at Boston, Mass., in the month of October, 1930, 15,000 cots, 30,000 blankets, 30,000 bed sheets, 15,000 pillows, 15,000 pillowcases, and 15,000 mattresses or bed sacks: *Provided*, That

no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of the said convention as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the American Legion 1930 Convention Corporation, through the director of housing of the American Legion 1930 Convention Corporation, Raymond O. Brackett: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War, before delivering said property, shall take from the said American Legion 1930 Convention Corporation a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POST-OFFICE SITE, AKRON, OHIO

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3246) to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in Akron, Ohio.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there does not seem to be any provision as to the minimum amount for which the remaining property is to be sold. In the original act of March 4, 1913, it was provided that the building and site should not be sold for any sum less than \$100,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, this bill, it will be noticed, provides that the remainder of the site will be sold upon the terms and conditions provided in the act of Congress of 1913. Hence, under that restriction, the remainder must be sold for at least the amount named in the original act, notwithstanding the small portion that has been diverted to street use.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That was my construction, but I wanted to make it clear that that was the intent of the bill; that it refers back to the act of 1913 and to the conditions there imposed.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would seem to be quite clear.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, has the Post Office Department decided they would not build a new Federal building in Akron?

Mr. CRAMTON. The act of 1913 definitely provided for the sale of this site. The only question involved in the bill that is now before the House is whether a small portion of the old site may be used for street purposes. Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] could explain it.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Answering the gentleman from Wisconsin, we have a new post office. This bill provides for the sale of the old site.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. But, if this bill is passed, will the site be sold to the public under competitive bids, or will it be a one-man transaction, such as these scandalous post-office leases we have recently found in the Post Office Department.

Mr. SEIBERLING. It will be sold in accordance with the law.

Mr. CRAMTON. It provides for advertisement; either public or private sale, after proper advertisement, under the existing law. The bill before the House only relates to the use of a small part of the property for a street.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to dispose of the Government property acquired for a post-office site at Akron, Ohio, located on the southeast corner of East Market and South High Streets, in the following manner: To transfer by the usual quitclaim deed to the city of Akron for the purpose of widening said East Market Street the northerly portion of said site, beginning at the intersection of the southerly line of East Market Street (between South Main and South High Streets) extended easterly with the eastern line of South High Street; thence with the eastern line of South High Street north 18° 25' east, 11.20 feet, to the southern line of East Market Street; thence with the southern line of East Market Street south 66° 13' east, 133.77 feet, to the western line of Wheeler Lane Alley; thence with the western line of Wheeler Lane Alley south 18° 21' west, 10.18 feet; thence north 60° 43' west, 63.04 feet; thence north 71° 54' west, 71.28 feet, to the place of beginning; and to sell the remainder of the site upon the terms and conditions provided in the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913, authorizing the sale of the above old post-office property in Akron, Ohio.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITIES FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10416) to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill introduces an entirely new policy in the method of constructing buildings by the departments. It gives a sort of blanket authority to the Secretary of Labor to erect buildings—small buildings, it is true—when, in his discretion, they are necessary, and to take the money out of the general appropriation fund. The next bill on the calendar provides the proper way of authorizing the construction of a building. I do not believe we should establish this policy and custom because, although small buildings are involved in this instance, such a policy and custom may grow into something very important.

Mr. CRAMTON. The precedent is not as serious as my friend conceives it to be. This permits funds to be expended from an appropriation for the general maintenance and operation of the Customs and Immigration Services, respectively, and for the acquisition of land and the erection of buildings, the expenditure for any one site, land and building, not to exceed \$3,000, unless it serves both services, when the limit would be \$6,000, of which, I suppose, part would come from the appropriation of one service and part from the appropriation of the other service.

This has to do with rather remote places, where some accommodations are necessary. Of course, it would not be at important points. Congress would not want to be disturbed by passing legislation each time they wanted to put up a \$3,000 building, including the cost of the site. If we did do that, it would probably result in raising the price demanded for the land because there had been some definite action of Congress upon it. As a matter of fact, we do this same thing, in effect, in many branches of the public service. I have in mind that in the item for the conduct of education in the Indian Service it is provided that a certain amount of the sum appropriated may be used for a purpose like this. I think the amount is \$2,500, or something like that. If the amount necessary is more than that, then there must be the specific approval of Congress.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Are they portable schools?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; they are small structures.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We appropriate for the erection of small structures for the Lighthouse Service and other departments.

Mr. CRAMTON. But not for items as small as \$3,000, including the site. Then, the gentleman must understand that the Customs and Immigration Services are facing special emergencies these days, and the setting up of new headquarters here and there on the borders is sometimes rather essential and urgent.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Does the gentleman know of any reason why this item should not come in the regular way in the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not think it would be in order. I would not want to say offhand, because I am not familiar with existing law, but I am rather inclined to assume that the thought of the department was that this would be of a legislative character, and if it were included in an appropriation bill it might be subject to a point of order. As a matter of fact, the expenditure would be supervised each year in connection with the appropriation bill.

Mr. GREENWOOD. If this bill should pass, then it would come in the regular way if they should make a recommendation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. When an appropriation for this purpose is requested there would naturally be a set-up indicating how many of these buildings are to be put up and how much they would cost. However, I will admit this: The appropriations for the fiscal year 1931 have gone through the House, both as to the Labor Department and as to the Treasury Department. This bill would authorize them to use some part of that in the fiscal year 1931 for these purposes without any further action by Congress.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It occurred to me it would be unnecessary and would cause annoyance to have the departments come in with these small items, and that it might be better to have a general law covering propositions of this kind.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the next thing we know they will be putting up post-office buildings.

Mr. CRAMTON. The protection here is the limitation as to the amount.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would the gentleman object to this: On page 1, line 4, after the word "points," insert the words

"along the Canadian and Mexican borders." I want to narrow it as much as I can.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say that I am a sort of pinch hitter here. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT], who fully understands the measure, was here earlier in the afternoon, but was called away. I promised to do what I could to explain the measure. I do not think an amendment of that kind would be an injury.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to narrow it so there will be no abuse of the authority.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not in authority, but I would not object to the amendment.

Mr. JENKINS. Here would be the trouble about that. As a member of the Committee on Immigration I have had some experience with the matter. These Customs and Immigration Service men are what we call the border patrol, but they do not operate altogether on the border. Sometimes they operate as far back as 200 miles from the border, and I think the main reason for this legislation is that they want to establish certain headquarters. For instance, I was on the Mexican border last year and met the border patrol there. They wanted to build a radio station out there in the mountains, and they wanted to make provision for it. This would have been a very great help to the border patrol and would not have cost much, and, of course, it would not have been on any permanent roadway.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will say to the gentleman that I have lived through the old pork-barrel days of appropriating for public buildings. I was on the Committee on Public Buildings when we brought in the bill which changed our whole system, and I think it is a great improvement, although there may be dissatisfaction here and there. I do not want to destroy that system by allowing a harmless bill to creep in, if you please, that may mean the establishment of a new policy.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman would be satisfied if the amendment is agreed to?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think with a limitation on the amount and a limitation with respect to the locality, it would be all right.

Mr. CRAMTON. If that will get the bill by, I think it will be quite satisfactory.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan as to the authority conferred by the proviso. The language is that the total amount which may be expended from any one appropriation shall not exceed \$3,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; for any one project.

Mr. STAFFORD (reading):

That the total amount which may be expended from any one appropriation for any one project.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. That might mean that from one appropriation for one year they may expend \$3,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. I see what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that should be eliminated?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; what they mean is this: They are treating of two services in two departments, Customs and Immigration, in Treasury and Labor and the language following provides that where it is from two appropriations, that is, appropriations for the two departments, it can be \$6,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no criticism as to the latter language, but as to the former language it is susceptible of the construction that the limitation only applies to one appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. What would the gentleman suggest, from the appropriation of one department?

Mr. STAFFORD (reading):

That the total amount which may be expended for any one project, including the cost of the site, shall not exceed \$3,000.

This gives full authority, and the language that follows is:

And that where quarters are erected or facilities provided for the joint use of the Customs and Immigration Services the combined cost charged to the two appropriations concerned shall not exceed \$6,000—

And so forth. My thought is to strike out the clause "from any one appropriation." The authority is still there and the limit of cost remains. It is not intended, I presume, to have the same amount taken from successive appropriations, but it seems to me the language would bear that construction.

Mr. CRAMTON. Suppose we strike out the language and after the word "construct," put in "for the use of the department."

Mr. STAFFORD. That is all right.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would clarify it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, one further suggestion, in reading the report I noted they wished authority at one time to have considered the buying of a piece of land with a building on it. The language restricts them merely to the acquisition of land.

Mr. CRAMTON. Where is the language that requires that?

Mr. STAFFORD. For instance, beginning at line 10, page 1, and continuing, "the necessary amounts for the acquisition of land." I would suggest there "and appurtenances, if any."

Mr. CRAMTON. I think that is included now, but I would not object to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think that might be included now, but a technical construction might be otherwise.

Mr. CRAMTON. If you buy the land, you get whatever is attached to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would be true if it were not for the following language which is, "and the erection of buildings, sheds, and office quarters," and so forth. For this reason I think it would be necessary to put in the qualifying phrase, "and appurtenances, if any."

Mr. CRAMTON. That would be agreeable.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the proponents of this bill to explain why we should pass a bill with the sky the limit, practically authorizing appropriations of hundreds of thousands of dollars, without any consideration by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, this does not increase the appropriations, it widens their availability. In the report signed jointly by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, Secretary Mellon and Secretary Davis—and I think the gentleman will agree that whatever these gentlemen agree on these days we ought to think is probably all right—in their joint report—

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman that while I may agree with these two Cabinet officers, in the future we may have a man in the Cabinet who is just about as responsible, when it comes to the taxpayer's money as a former member of the Cabinet has been with respect to post-office building leases.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me say to the gentleman, he did not get my remark. These two Cabinet officers agree on the necessity, and they make this statement:

The highways at these points are not permanently improved, nor is there definite assurance that the present locations of the roads will be maintained when improvement is finally made. It would, therefore, be unwise to expend considerable sums of Government funds to provide buildings for office purposes and living quarters at these points. The existing conditions, however, are deplorable and the facilities inadequate. Such situations could be remedied inexpensively if the respective appropriations for the Customs and Immigration Services were available for constructing modest but neat and comfortable offices and living quarters.

The sites in such localities could often be obtained without expense and in all cases at a nominal cost.

If this bill passes it will not authorize any new appropriation. It simply authorizes the use of the appropriations available and Congress always has an opportunity to review them.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Available for construction or available for salaries and for other purposes?

Mr. CRAMTON. They will necessarily be restricted, because other demands on these appropriations are so pressing all the time.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the same buildings be used as an arsenal to house shotguns of Federal agents who are waging war against violators of the prohibition law?

Mr. CRAMTON. They might use one as a kind of fortress of defense against well-armed rum runners, but the report does not mention it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It is clear that the necessity for this bill shows that it is another extraordinary expense put on the taxpayers as the result of prohibition. I shall not object. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, it is understood that I shall offer an amendment which will not be resisted?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from New York will make it clear—I do not want to agree to an amendment that could be construed as meaning that the building must be exactly on the border line. If it is to be construed simply as having to do with enforcement on the border that is all right.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is understood that it means along the Canadian and Mexican borders—that it means the border service—anywhere within the area of the border service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws at points where no Federal buildings are available or buildings adapted or suitably located for the purpose are available for rental, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor are hereby authorized to expend from the funds appropriated for the general maintenance and operation of the Customs and Immigration Services, respectively, the necessary amounts for the acquisition of land and the erection of buildings, sheds, and office quarters, including living quarters for officers where none are otherwise available: *Provided*, That the total amount which may be expended from any one appropriation for any one project, including the cost of the site, shall not exceed \$3,000, and that where quarters are erected or facilities provided for the joint use of the Customs and Immigration Services the combined cost charged to the two appropriations concerned shall not exceed \$6,000 for any one project, including the site.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "points," insert "along the Canadian and Mexican borders."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I think if the gentleman will insert that after the word "laws" in the same line it will be a little clearer.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will modify my amendment to that extent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "laws," insert "along the Canadian and Mexican borders."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out the words "from any one appropriation," and after the word "project," in line 5, insert "for the use of one department."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING FOR RADIO RESEARCH INVESTIGATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10652) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to purchase land and to construct buildings and facilities suitable for radio research investigation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, the report does not give any information as to what is being done in the way of radio research by universities. I know there is considerable research work being undertaken by certain of our larger universities. In fact the Navy Department is sending to certain universities their advanced students, members of the Signal Corps, or what corresponds to that service if in the Army, to take advanced studies. I have read the report rather carefully, and I had difficulty in seeing why we should establish special centers for this work away from the Bureau of Standards.

There is some argument made, it is true, as to the need of these investigational studies in radio broadcasting free from electrical and other disturbances, but what possesses me mostly is that there is no showing here that it is necessary to have this work undertaken under the auspices of the Bureau of Standards. I am especially interested in learning whether it is necessary to have the Bureau of Standards to undertake this work if similar studies are being undertaken by private establishments. As this involves considerable expense, I ask unanimous consent, as the gentleman from Indiana is not present to explain the real purposes of the bill, that it may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7585) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of

rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is merely an authorization for an appropriation?

Mr. COLTON. This amends the basic law. It is a little more than an authorization bill. There would have to be an authorization bill passed later. This amends the law of July 11, 1916, and would make it possible for an authorization bill to follow.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But you would have to come here for an authorization bill?

Mr. COLTON. Yes. That is as I understand the situation.

Mr. CRAMTON. What does the gentleman mean by an authorization bill?

Mr. COLTON. Take as an illustration the Dowell bill. The Dowell bill is bottomed on the same legislation that this bill seeks to amend, and yet each two years we bring in an authorization bill for an appropriation. If we follow that precedent, we would pass an authorization bill.

Mr. COLLINS. This bill, as I understand it, simply permits these public-land States to get an additional sum of money other than that they now get under the regular road appropriation bill. Under present law in determining the amount that these States receive, the extent of public land is considered, but this bill will enable these States to get an additional sum of money.

Mr. COLTON. Yes. We are working, of course, as the gentleman knows—

Mr. COLLINS. To get more.

Mr. COLTON. On a general road-building program in the United States, and as is the case with forest reserves, there are tracts of land owned by the Government of the United States that are not within forests across which we need to build connecting links, and this would authorize the Congress in the future to make special appropriations to take care of those cases in the public-land States where, under existing conditions, roads on the Federal-aid system can not be built. It would enable us to do on a smaller scale what we are doing in the national forests.

Mr. COLLINS. When the authorization bill was enacted, all of these things about which the gentleman speaks were considered.

Mr. COLTON. So far as I am informed, the hearings do not so disclose. There was an attempt only to provide for a general system of Federal-aid roads and to appropriate for that Federal-aid system in a general way, and also for the forests' highways, but no special consideration given to the roads on the public domain. No provision has ever been made for them. Yet there are many places where help is imperative if we are ever to have a completed road system.

Mr. COLLINS. The result of the passage of this bill would be to give these particular States all that they ordinarily get out of general road appropriations and in addition this added amount.

Mr. COLTON. Whatever Congress should see fit to appropriate to build roads across the Government land would, of course, be added.

Mr. COLLINS. And at the present time you can not get what you would get if this bill should pass?

Mr. COLTON. No; and we can not get roads that form connecting links on the public domain without special appropriations.

Mr. COLLINS. And if this bill should be agreed to, what would it cost to build the roads through these States?

Mr. COLTON. It is understood that we would ask for perhaps two or three million dollars for three years, until some of the absolutely necessary links in Federal-aid roads are constructed.

Mr. COLLINS. Thirty million dollars has been suggested to me.

Mr. COLTON. Oh, no such amounts are contemplated. I say two or three million dollars for a period of two or three years, and not to exceed nine or ten millions. Two years ago Congress passed a special authorization act authorizing three and a half million dollars for three years, or a total of ten and a half million dollars for this purpose. The bill passed both Houses but was vetoed by the President.

Mr. COLLINS. And this is the same bill?

Mr. COLTON. No.

Mr. COLLINS. Or practically the same bill that Mr. Coolidge vetoed?

Mr. COLTON. No. That was a special appropriation bill. This bill would amend the basic law and enable Congress to pass special appropriation bills as the circumstances justified. This legislation has been indorsed by the National Association of Highway Officials and by many other associations all over the

country which are interested in securing good roads. There is no other way of raising the money to build the roads across the Government land except for Congress to appropriate.

Mr. COLLINS. I much prefer an authorization, so that Congress can know the outside figure to be expended.

Mr. CRAMTON. The other bill that was vetoed by President Coolidge I thought I could unders and, but I am at rather a loss on this one. It provides, first:

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the State highway departments and with the Department of the Interior in the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations other than the forest reservations.

I do not understand that the Department of Agriculture cooperates with State authorities in maintaining roads now in Federal highway systems. That would be a new departure there, would it not?

Mr. COLTON. They cooperate in maintaining forest roads, but not on the Federal-aid system of roads outside the national forests.

Mr. CRAMTON. But on this they do cooperate?

Mr. COLTON. Yes. They would cooperate until there was some other way of maintaining the roads.

Mr. CRAMTON. That first sentence is based purely on a question of cooperation between the Federal and the State Governments. Then the bill provides:

Such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize to be expended under the provisions of this section shall be apportioned among those States having more than 5 per cent of their area in the lands hereinbefore described and shall be prorated and apportioned to said States in the proportion that said lands in each of said States is to the total area of said lands in the States eligible under the provisions of this section, and no contribution from the States shall be required in the expenditure thereof.

That would seem to mean that when Congress passes the agricultural appropriation bill at this Congress with \$125,000,000 for the fiscal year 1931, under this authority a portion of that \$125,000,000—and the bill has not yet passed the House and Senate but is in conference and will not become a law inside of several weeks—would be available for the construction of roads across these lands without State cooperation.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. CRAMTON. Because the language is not "such sums as Congress may hereafter authorize to be appropriated," but "such sums as Congress may hereafter authorize to be expended." When we pass an appropriation bill we authorize the expenditure of that money, and hence any road item in an appropriation bill that becomes a law after this bill becomes a law would be available for the construction of these roads.

Mr. COLTON. There was no intention of doing that. I am willing to change that language so as to provide that, "such sums as Congress shall hereafter authorize to be appropriated," shall be substituted for the language just read. There is no intention to divert any of the \$125,000,000 to this special purpose. There are connecting links in our Federal-aid system that cross large areas of public domain, where there is no privately owned property at all, nothing to be taxed. We want help for such areas.

It is an impossibility to build roads in some sections now.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman from Utah that I am in thorough sympathy with what he is trying to do. I have been through those regions where the Government owns all the land, with nothing taxable. I think the Government, if it is going to have a national system of highways, needs to connect them up across its own property, and I would like to see the bill, if it goes through, made clear enough and extensive enough to accomplish what is wanted. The first sentence authorizes the department to cooperate. The second sentence says the money shall be apportioned among the States—

And no contribution from the States shall be required in the expenditure thereof.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman will realize that in most of the States the money for building roads is raised by taxation in the counties, and the counties are the units. There are large areas of land where there is no taxable property, and if we made it on the basis of cooperation we would get nowhere in building the roads to which I am referring.

Mr. CRAMTON. But there is a conflict between those two sentences.

Further, a later sentence reads:

The roads constructed and maintained under the provisions of this section shall be of the same standard as to width and character of construction as the Federal Government requires of the States under like conditions.

This is a question that I went into a couple of years ago with Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Hughes, of the Bureau of Public Roads. In fact, I met them when they were making a study of this very problem in New Mexico. At that time Mr. MacDonald had come to the conclusion—and so far as I know he still holds to that belief—that a great deal of good could be done by building not the sort of paved highways that we require of the States in connected highways, roads that run into large amounts of money, but roads that would be sufficient to take care of the traffic that is calling for them; and it would seem to me that this sentence to which I have called attention would be contrary to the belief of Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would not this requirement also compel the service to make the same width of road going over the mountains, which would be very expensive?

Mr. CRAMTON. You take the Navajo country and other Indian reservations. There is no occasion there for a paved highway. Your money would not last long enough if you made the highways to cover those areas.

Mr. COLTON. In none of these places are they building even a paved highway. The most we hope to get is a gravel road.

Mr. CRAMTON. What is the minimum standard that the Government requires in the expenditures of Federal funds in cooperation with the States? They are higher, in my opinion, than the standard Mr. MacDonald has in mind here.

Mr. COLTON. I think those standards vary. I do not think you could state exactly what they are in all cases. They vary.

Mr. MacDonald, the Director of the Bureau of Public Roads, has heartily indorsed this bill. He came before the committee and urged the passage of the bill. The only reason for this measure is that if we are building through a section—and I may say that the gentleman must not get the impression that our States are not building roads, even across Government lands, because we are building many roads across Government-owned land—the only reason I say is simply to take care of instances where we can not raise money for building the type of roads absolutely needed and recommended by the Bureau of Public Roads without Government aid. Where these connecting links are built they should be built to the same standard as the approaching roads, in order that they may carry the same traffic.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, my objection to this bill was as to the distribution of funds. My understanding is that the Bureau of Public Roads has a restriction on the spending of the money to places where the department believes it should be spent. But under this bill you will allocate the funds in the public domain.

Mr. COLTON. I would rather leave the discretion in the Bureau of Public Roads in accordance with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. We make the allocation of the funds to the various States, and after they are allocated the department should use its discretion in cooperation with the States in deciding upon particular places for its use. The allotments are made on the ratio of the publicly owned land to the privately owned lands within each State.

Mr. GREENWOOD. How is it allocated?

Mr. COLTON. It is allocated by the Department of Agriculture on the basis of the public domain within the various States, if that is what the gentleman means. Of course, the original allocation is made under the provisions of the basic road act, but the per cent of participation by the Federal Government is determined by the amount of public lands.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Is it the purpose to base it on the proportion of the Government-owned land in the public-land States?

Mr. COLTON. Yes; the participation by the Government is on that basis.

No doubt it would give a larger assignment to that State where it is absolutely needed, than to some State where not so much was needed.

Mr. GREENWOOD. But they are held down to a percentage basis. They have no discretion now in distributing the fund, except on a fixed percentage basis.

Mr. COLTON. No. It is exactly the same as under the provisions of the forest act.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it not a fact that this greatly extends our maintenance obligation?

Mr. COLTON. It extends it to that part that we would build on the public domain until there is some method of maintaining the roads; yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, we will assume permanently, as long as these are Federal lands, the maintenance as well as the construction. I have the impression that the Colton bill, which was passed by the House, provided for State maintenance.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] asks unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REIMBURSABLE CHARGES AGAINST INDIAN TRIBES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10879) directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate reimbursable charges against Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this subject is one of very great importance in which the department has already a very large amount of authority. There is nothing to prevent the department studying this question, and using funds now available, and making such recommendations as they desire. Not only that, but considerable has been done with reference to this subject. In the last two or three years I have been somewhat responsible for wiping off the slate certain charges that were put on the books as reimbursable charges. They have just reorganized the bureau. The commissioner and assistant commissioner are new men of good ability and high ideals. They are trying to familiarize themselves with conditions. I think it will be better to let them have a little time to get familiar with conditions before thrusting upon them heavy new burdens.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. As I understand the gentleman's position, this is work which should be done, but—

Mr. CRAMTON. But should be done properly.

Mr. LEAVITT. But which does not require this particular piece of legislation?

Mr. CRAMTON. Legislation no doubt would be required before the job is completed. But legislation is not required to authorize the department to make the study and funds are not required.

Mr. LEAVITT. But the department states, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs states, that they do require some additional funds in order to make the study of the reclamation projects on the Indian reservations.

Mr. CRAMTON. My thought is that they have no need for \$50,000, and I do not believe it is desirable to go out with a brass band and try to organize a demand for wiping charges off the slate. I would like to see it done in some kind of a judicial spirit, without regard to local demands that may be aroused through the passage of this bill.

Mr. LEAVITT. Of course, the purpose of this bill, in the mind of the Committee on Indian Affairs, is to meet one of the most fundamental problems in solving the entire Indian question. It is to make possible the adjustment of some of these charges that exist against Indian tribes from long times in the past and which are hampering their advancement.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think something should be done.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Why could we not wipe them off the books?

Mr. CRAMTON. The new Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs have been identified with organizations which had high ideals and theories but not in touch with facts. They are going into the field, as they have an opportunity, to study conditions. In six months or a year they will be much better able to judge of those conditions. I believe they have enough troubles without thrusting this burden precipitately upon them.

Mr. LEAVITT. In reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], I introduced a bill about a year ago that would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, on his own investigation, to wipe out charges that are unjustly standing against Indian tribes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And these are old, uncollected charges?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes. On one Indian reservation years ago, by authority of Congress, an irrigation ditch was built and a wooden flume. The Indians were not taught how to use the water. The wooden flume has fallen down for many years, and still the cost of that project rests against that Indian tribe. We are at this time trying to get lands allotted to them and bring them closer to being self-supporting, but when it comes to a question of funds to enable them to do this which is now constructively necessary we find these old charges, in that case, the reclamation charge. As far as this same tribe is concerned, there is another instance where the Government said to these Indians, "We ought to use your money to buy a herd of cattle"; and then the Government, handling their herd of cattle, lost nearly all of them. Still, the charges are against the Indians.

When the Indians get a little money, using reason, of course, because they do not want to injure the Indians, the authorities take, as opportunity comes, money from those Indians to meet these old charges.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think it is doubtful, Mr. Speaker, whether a dollar has ever been taken to pay off these old charges. Not recently, in any event.

Mr. LEAVITT. I know it has been done.

Mr. CRAMTON. But not in recent years.

Mr. LEAVITT. Congress should authorize the Indian Bureau to wipe out these charges, just as would be the case if the gentleman from Michigan and myself, owing money to a bank, should fall into difficulties, or ill health, or something like that, the bank could adjust that debt with us and give us more time to wipe out some of it; but there is no authority with regard to these debts against the Indians at this time to readjust them and charge them off, and it must be done.

Mr. CRAMTON. But, in the last 10 years, I think I am safe in saying that not one dollar of Indian funds has been used to pay construction irrigation charges.

Mr. LEAVITT. I have received a letter within the last two weeks from a man who owns land in one of these irrigation projects, who got authority and sold some other land thinking it would enable him to plant his crops and help educate his children, and he found that that entire amount, or much of it, had been taken to pay off some accumulated water charges on other lands that he owned, under an irrigation project.

Mr. CRAMTON. Was he a restricted Indian?

Mr. LEAVITT. He is a restricted Indian or they could not handle his funds.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, that is something new to me. Year after year we go over all of these Indian irrigation projects and we find the amount that has been expended for construction and that nothing is being collected. We have not urged that there ought to be any collections. I think it is desirable that there be a study of these things. There is ample authority of law for them to make the study and there is no limit of the authority to make appropriations. If this bill passes, then they can spend \$50,000, and after that they can not spend anything.

Mr. LEAVITT. This \$50,000 is merely to pay the cost of a careful study, including the services of two men not now a part of the Indian Bureau and who, under the present situation, could not be hired.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is nothing to prevent them from getting the money from the Committee on Appropriations through an appropriation bill, and if anything had been said to our committee showing the need of those two men for that purpose I am sure it would have met the approval of the committee. I am sure there is nothing to prevent them from hiring those men now to make this study.

Mr. LEAVITT. That entirely satisfies me.

Mr. CRAMTON. They have as much right to have those men as they have to have a Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. LEAVITT. If they have the money.

Mr. CRAMTON. If they need money, they should ask for it.

Mr. LEAVITT. I will present the matter in connection with the next deficiency bill, because all I am interested in is not the passage of this bill but to get the study made and these old charges adjusted.

Mr. CRAMTON. However, we are not going to have men appointed who think the Treasury of the United States only exists for the purpose of relieving Indians.

Mr. LEAVITT. There is nothing in this bill which contemplates that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am sure of that, because it is presented by the gentleman from Montana, in whom I have a great deal of confidence. If men are selected who will use good, common horse sense and have some regard for the Treasury of the United States, I think nobody will object to their appointment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And the gentleman from Michigan says if you will apply for the appropriation you will get it.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is very, very good news to me.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. So that is eliminated. Now, assuming this study is made, has the commissioner or the Secretary of the Interior authority at the present time to wipe off some of these old charges?

Mr. LEAVITT. No, he has not; and this bill would not give it to him.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then you are all right if you get your appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think I am justified in saying that within the last year or two, through the cooperation of the gentleman from Montana and myself, from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 of

such charges have been wiped off, where the propriety for such action was very clear and recommended by the bureau.

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes. The gentleman from Michigan has been very helpful in that direction. This bill is the result of a proposal made by me along the line of the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, that the Secretary be given authority to adjust these old charges. The department reported that the method in this bill is the better method, but I do not agree with them. I think there should be direct authority to do that.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Well, the gentleman has the direct commitment of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEAVITT. I will state that I am entirely satisfied with to-day's developments in the advancement of this idea.

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, I can not speak for the committee but am expressing my own views.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask if this bill contemplates an investigation such as is covered in a bill I introduced, authorizing a suit—and which has been indorsed, as I understand, by the Department of the Interior—for the Warm Springs Indians. Does this bill contemplate an investigation of their claims?

Mr. LEAVITT. This bill would authorize and call for an investigation of all outstanding reimbursable charges against Indian tribes, and would appropriate \$50,000 for expenses on the statement of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that that amount is necessary to make the proper investigation of reimbursable charges having to do with reclamation projects on Indian reservations. Then, as the next step it would require that the report of the findings be made to the Congress so that Congress could then take such action as was necessary or justified under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

UTAH STATE TREASURER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1601) to authorize the Department of Agriculture to issue two duplicate checks in favor of Utah State treasurer where the originals have been lost.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3646, as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, the disbursing clerk of the Department of Agriculture is authorized and directed to issue, without the requirement of an indemnity bond, a duplicate of original check No. 42772, drawn March 17, 1928, in favor of Utah State treasurer for \$1,066.27 and original check No. 52754, drawn March 17, 1928, in favor of Utah State treasurer for \$21,848.96, and lost, stolen, or miscarried in the mails.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE NATIONAL PARKS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8163) to facilitate the administration of the national parks by the United States Department of the Interior, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill is one that is very desirable.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Consent Calendar will be reached again within 10 days.

Mr. CRAMTON. As the bill is to be passed over, I would like to make this statement: That the committee has eliminated sections 3 and 11, as I understand. That is upon the theory that those matters are sufficiently taken care of in H. R. 5568, which is now pending. I happen to be the introducer of H. R. 5568, the uniform contract bill, and while I am hopeful it may pass and become law, it has not yet been reported by the committee and no one can guarantee it will become law. Hence it is my suggestion that the committee consider leaving sections 3 and 11 in the bill. Then, of course, if the contract bill does become law, all right; otherwise they would be in and effective.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CARLSBAD CAVERNS NATIONAL PARK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9895) to establish the Carlsbad Caverns National Park, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of this bill what is the probable cost and what is the real reason for the enactment of the legislation?

Mr. COLLINS. I am not the author, but I have given some thought to this bill. The Carlsbad Caverns undoubtedly are the greatest caverns in this country and, perhaps, in the whole world. They were discovered, so I understand, in 1900, by a man by the name of Jim White, and were brought to the attention of Dr. George Otis Smith, Director of the Geological Survey, by Hon. Richard F. Burges, of El Paso, Tex., not only one of the great lawyers of this country, but one of our foremost bibliophiles. The interest of this distinguished American in these caverns, without doubt, hastened the Interior Department in making investigations which will ultimately disclose underground scenic beauties not elsewhere to be found.

Mr. SIMMS. Mr. Speaker, it is not contemplated, as I understand, under the terms of the bill to substantially increase the annual outlay for the operation of this natural wonder. It is thought by the Director of the National Park Service and others in authority that the Carlsbad Caverns Monument, as it is now, is of sufficient importance and interest from many standpoints to justify its inclusion among the national parks of the country. It has attracted the favorable attention of hundreds of thousands of people of the country.

Mr. JONES of Texas. If the gentleman will yield I would like to suggest that the folks in my section of the country regard this, as I think it is generally regarded, as the most wonderful thing of its kind in the world. I think the adoption of this measure is thoroughly justified.

Mr. JENKINS. What I am particularly interested in is this: I notice it has been considered heretofore as a national monument. What change is it proposed to make?

Mr. SIMMS. No change in the expenditure of money, simply a change in status to include it among the more important areas of the country.

Mr. COLTON. In other words, this makes of it a national park instead of a national monument.

Mr. LEAVITT. If the gentleman will permit, it was a national monument to begin with because, as a great natural wonder that had been discovered and partly explored, it could be withdrawn by proclamation of the President and preserved during its development. This development has shown it to be what the other gentlemen speaking for the bill have said, one of the greatest natural wonders in the world, and action of Congress is required to give it national park status.

Mr. JENKINS. This carries with it, naturally—

Mr. LEAVITT. No increased appropriation, because it has been developed already on the standard of a national park. The same thing happened, let me add, in connection with the great canyon known as the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. It went through this same process, first presidential proclamation and then an act of Congress creating it a national park.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Is this a part of the public domain at the present time, so it will not be necessary to buy any of the land?

Mr. SIMMS. It is a part of the public domain. It may interest gentlemen to know that the receipts from the park are greater than the annual outlay.

Mr. JENKINS. I am pleased to have that information.

Mr. BRIGGS. As I understand, it is not contemplated to place any heavier burden upon the Government than now obtains in connection with its upkeep?

Mr. SIMMS. Not at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the tract of land heretofore known as the Carlsbad Cave National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, established and designated as a national monument under the act of June 8, 1906, entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," and by presidential proclamation of October 25, 1923, be, and the same is hereby, declared to be a national park and dedicated as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people under the name of

the Carlsbad Caverns National Park, under which name the aforesaid national park shall be entitled to receive and to use all moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the Carlsbad Cave National Monument.

SEC. 2. That the administration, protection, and development of said Carlsbad Caverns National Park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," and acts supplementary thereto or amendatory thereof.

SEC. 3. That the provisions of the act of June 10, 1920, known as the Federal water power act, shall not apply to or extend over the land hereby or hereafter reserved and dedicated as the Carlsbad Caverns National Park.

SEC. 4. That the boundaries of said Carlsbad Caverns National Park may be enlarged by subsequent proclamation or proclamations of the President upon the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF TIMBERLAND IN MINNESOTA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9934) providing for the sale of timberland in four townships in the State of Minnesota.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question with reference to the application of existing law. I find on page 2 of the committee report that the commissioner states that:

These lands are subject to sale under section 2455, Revised Statutes, if isolated tracts, at public auction at not less than the appraised price.

Why is it necessary to enact this legislation and provide for closed sale without the public having an opportunity to buy under competitive conditions?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply to the gentleman that an attempt was made by various individuals to buy some of these tracts last fall but the land office at Cass Lake held they were not isolated tracts and would therefore have to be entered as agricultural lands. The purpose of this legislation is to permit the sale of these lands under the same conditions as those carried in the stone and timber act, which would not require residence thereon.

As the gentleman will observe, these lands are to be sold at \$2.50 an acre, and the money is to be paid into the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians in accordance with treaty.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And this is limited to only four townships?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; and I might say further that terming these lands timberlands is erroneous, because they were burnt over very severely last fall; in fact, my best judgment is that all they would be good for now would be for pasturage.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman have any objection to incorporating an amendment inserting the words, "at public sale," after the word "sold," in line 7?

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not know that I would object, but I do not think that would make any material difference. The treaty with the Chippewa Indians provides that these lands shall be sold for \$2.50 an acre, and I can assure the gentleman that is all the lands are worth. I do not see why it should be necessary to hold a public sale. In the first place, it would probably not be possible to dispose of all of them at one time, and under the gentleman's amendment they could only be sold at public sale. Under the language of the bill as it now stands anyone could go to the land office at Cass Lake and buy these lands at any time for \$2.50 an acre. They may sell 40 acres now and 40 acres next month or next year, but if they were compelled to advertise these lands every so often probably they would not be able to get them up for sale more than once or twice and they could not be sold after that were done. Then, too, the cost of advertising would probably consume the total receipts.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Inasmuch as the author of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson], is a chief of the Chippewas and seems to think that the bill without the amendment will produce more revenue for the Chippewas I shall withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That vacant, unappropriated, unreserved lands valued chiefly for timber in townships 158 and 159 north, range 32 west and in townships 158 and 159, range 33 west, fifth principal

meridian, Beltrami County, Minn., in the former Red Lake Indian Reservation, may be sold to citizens of the United States, or to persons who have declared their intention to become such, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, in quantities not exceeding 160 acres to any one person or association of persons, at the appraised value, but in no case less than \$2.50 per acre: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall defeat or impair any bona fide claim under any law of the United States, or authorize the sale of the improvements of any bona fide settler.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIXING THE SIZE OF FARM UNITS ON DESERT-LAND ENTRIES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1186) to amend section 5 of the act of June 27, 1906, conferring authority upon the Secretary of the Interior to fix the size of farm units on desert-land entries when included within national reclamation projects.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill a question. I notice on page 2 of the bill it provides that certain homestead rights given to people, under certain conditions, are required to relinquish them. From the standpoint of the law against confiscation of property, how can you justify that?

Mr. FRENCH. I am glad to answer the gentleman. The bill refers to lands upon which entries under the desert land act were made before reclamation withdrawal. Following the withdrawal an entryman under the desert land law could go ahead and develop a water system of his own with which to reclaim his land, and thus would not need to come under the reclamation project. On the other hand, should he prefer to come under the general reclamation law and receive the advantages through the development of the reclamation project that other settlers receive, he ought to conform to the conditions imposed on other people who have homesteaded lands or who own private property.

Mr. JENKINS. My idea was that you were going to establish a water system and compel him to give up half of his land.

Mr. FRENCH. No; we do not compel him to unless he prefers the system and wants to come in and develop his land under the same conditions that other people accept, some, even, who own property in fee—

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso to section 5 of the act of June 27, 1906, chapter 3359, Thirty-fourth Statutes, page 520, be amended so as to read as follows:

"Provided, That if after investigation the irrigation project has been or may be abandoned by the Government, time for compliance with the desert land law by any such entryman shall begin to run from the date of notice of such abandonment of the project and the restoration to the public domain of the lands withdrawn in connection therewith, and credit shall be allowed for all expenditures and improvements theretofore made on any such desert-land entry of which proof has been or may be filed; but if the reclamation project is carried to completion so as to make available a water supply for the land embraced in any such desert-land entry the entryman shall thereupon comply with all the provisions of the aforesaid act of June 17, 1902, and shall relinquish all land embraced within his desert-land entry in excess of one farm unit, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and as to such retained farm unit he shall be entitled to make final proof and obtain patent upon compliance with the regulations of said Secretary applicable to the remainder of the irrigable land of the project and with the terms of payment prescribed in said act of June 17, 1902, and not otherwise. But nothing herein contained shall be held to require a desert-land entryman who owns a water right and reclaims the land embraced in his entry to accept the conditions of said reclamation act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "relinquish," insert "within a reasonable time after notice as the Secretary may prescribe and not less than two years."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS OF COTTON GINNING

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10173) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations of cotton ginning.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I want to inquire if this study is on the mechanical end of the process, or is it the agricultural study that is contemplated?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is the mechanical process.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would it not fit better in the Bureau of Standards than in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, I think not; because \$50,000,000 damages done to the lint cotton produced each year is caused by the gin saws tearing and cutting the staple of the lint cotton all to pieces, greatly decreasing the spinnable value of the staple. In addition to this, the uniformity of the staple is destroyed, both elements of damage resulting in a greater cost to the spinners in manufacturing the lint into cloth and in the production of inferior cloth. You understand the length, strength, and the uniformity of the staple or fiber are three of the most valuable spinnable factors in cotton. These are destroyed by the present ginning process, and the results contemplated by this bill are desired by both the cotton producer and the spinners.

You understand manufacturers of ginning machinery seek to manufacture that which is desired by their customers. Their customers, the ginners, want machinery that will turn out the most lint per hour or per day, as they charge for ginning by the 100 pounds. Thus, no attention has in the past been paid to the proper ginning of cotton with a view of conserving its value as produced in nature. As a result, \$50,000,000 of created wealth is destroyed each year through the ginning process of cotton. The Bureau of Standards have no expert scientists on the length, strength, and uniformity of cotton staple, and no way of determining when it had been damaged, and could not possibly solve the problem.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It seems to me that if this was a research of the mechanical end that it would be better for the Bureau of Standards to do it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The grading of the staple is done by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the Bureau of Standards carries on practically all of its work in Washington, whereas this would be done necessarily in the field.

Mr. STAFFORD. A very strong point why it should be in the Department of Agriculture is that the work of the Bureau of Standards is confined at their headquarters here, while this work is done in the field in various agricultural States.

Mr. COLLINS. Cotton farmers are greatly interested in the experimental gin plant. There is general complaint that the staple, and frequently the grade of cotton, are greatly injured by present methods of ginning. This is especially true of the public gin.

The bill provides for experiments to improve cotton ginning by the Department of Agriculture. The proper conditions of ginning will be studied and types of machinery will be investigated. The matters of moisture and temperature will be investigated. The purpose is to eliminate the losses now sustained by cotton farmers. It is estimated that the farmers of the South are now losing about \$30,000,000 annually on account of insufficient ginning. A better fiber will result, and the manufacturer and the consumer will be benefited.

The public gin operates too fast, and cotton is frequently gin out as a result of being too green when ginned.

The farmer knows that there is a defect in modern ginning, and the aim of the bill is to ascertain and correct the faults and defects which are quite general. The cotton grower will greatly benefit. The legislation is in aid of agriculture.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If you gentlemen from the cotton region think this is all right, it is satisfactory to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In my district there is a mechanical department of the agricultural college which has an experiment station, and they carry on a bureau of engineering and experimentation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would the gentleman suggest that we leave it to that establishment to work out, instead of having the Federal Government undertake it?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, certainly not. Agricultural colleges are very essential in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture but are not equipped to solve problems like this one.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would it be agreeable to the gentleman to have section 2 amended and make it "not more than \$100,000," so that the committee handling the appropriation, of which the gentleman from Texas is a member, can decide whether or not as much money as this is necessary?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That will be perfectly satisfactory to me. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to investigate the ginning of cotton; to establish and maintain experimental ginning plants and laboratories; and to make such tests, demonstrations, and experiments, and such technical and scientific studies in relation to cotton ginning as he shall deem necessary, and to publish the results thereof, with a view to developing improved ginning equipment and encouraging the use of improved methods, and he may cooperate with any department or agency of the Government, any State, Territory, District, or possession, or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or any person, as he shall find to be necessary.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and thereafter such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 7, after the word "appropriated," insert the words "not more than."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to estimate the value of the pending legislation to the cotton industry. There is much need for the proposed investigations of cotton ginning. The studies already made by the Department of Agriculture indicate many benefits to cotton growers.

The bill was introduced and fostered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], and I take occasion in this connection to say that the agricultural interests of the Nation, and especially the cotton growers of the South, are indebted to Mr. BUCHANAN for his efficient and effective work as a member of the powerful Committee on Appropriations and as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. He is ever alert to take advantage of any opportunity in behalf of agriculture, and his long experience and comprehensive studies combine to make him an invaluable member of the Committee on Appropriations.

DETERIORATION

Largely as a result of his activity, the agricultural appropriation bill of 1928, and subsequent years, contains an annual appropriation of \$10,000 for ginning studies. The bill for the current year also carries an additional \$10,000 for laboratory studies of cotton fibers, and a further item of \$10,000 for the studies of the engineering phases of cotton ginning.

Mr. BUCHANAN is an authority on agricultural legislation, and he is always receptive to any plans to promote the progress of cotton growing and other agricultural pursuits.

Senator PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi, who is always active in behalf of the cotton growers of the South, introduced a companion bill, known as S. 3687, in the Senate, which has been unanimously and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

As a cotton grower and as a cotton ginner, I have been interested in the improvement of cotton ginning for years. On December 19, 1929, as shown by page 981 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, during the consideration of the current agricultural appropriation bill, I made an argument in support of more adequate appropriations for the investigations of cotton ginning. I am thoroughly familiar with the pending bill and have conferred from time to time during the session with Mr. BUCHANAN, Senator HARRISON, and many other Members of the House and Senate, to promote the legislation, and have had the matter up with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and with the Bureau of Standards. There is cooperation between these two bureaus in improving the standards of cotton ginning. It has been thought best that the investigations should continue to be under the supervision of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, because the problem is primarily an agricultural one.

Cotton is the oldest and most universal of all fibers. It was found in the Western Hemisphere when Columbus discovered America. It is grown on all continents. Generally cultivated, it sometimes grows without cultivation and is known as wild cotton. Cotton was cultivated 800 years before Christ. Separation of the fiber from the seed was first done by hand. This primitive method obtains in remote parts of Africa, India, and China to-day. Machinery now, however, is almost universally used. I can recall the old hand or horse gins. The feeding of the gins by hand and the tramping of the cotton into the press by foot have been succeeded by modern suction saw gins and by hydraulic presses. The hand and the horse have been succeeded by steam, oil, and electricity.

Gins are of two kinds, the roller and the saw types. The roller type of gin was first employed and Egyptian cotton is

now ginned on roller gins. The invention of the saw gin by Eli Whitney in 1792 revolutionized cotton production. The saw gin stands out in contrast to the roller gin and is now generally used in ginning not only short-staple but long-staple cotton. Formerly sea-island cotton was produced in southeastern United States, in the ginning of which roller gins were used. It is believed that ginning of the longer Delta staples would be materially improved by the use of roller gins. All types of ginning will be investigated under the pending bill. Both the brush and the air-blast types of gins will be studied.

There is universal complaint that Delta staples and other long-staple cottons are being seriously injured by improper cotton ginning to-day. Just recently Mr. David R. Coker, of South Carolina, the outstanding cottonseed breeder in the entire country, informed me that he almost despaired of the future of staple-cotton production because of the inability to secure proper ginning. In the fall of 1929 Mr. Coker examined the staple of a certain cotton in the field as it was being harvested and was later greatly disappointed to find that this staple had been materially shortened at the gin. In 1925 two cotton growers in the Mississippi Delta planted the same seed on similar land. The cotton was ginned on different gins. There was a difference of one-sixteenth of an inch in the staple, or one planter lost 3 cents per pound, or \$15 a bale, on his cotton.

The separation of the cotton fiber from the seed by hand results in a very much better staple than the separation by the use of machinery. The hand gin, with its slow processes, gave much better staples than modern gin machinery.

There is a deterioration in long and short cotton as a result of improper ginning. It is a difficult, if not a delicate, process to gin short-staple cotton. It is more difficult to gin long-staple cotton. Inadequate ginning may change a profit in cotton production to a loss.

EXPERIMENTS

Improper ginning results in a loss of wealth already created. There is a great economic waste in ginning. The preparation of cotton for the market is frequently neglected by the grower. The cotton gin and the cotton ginner occupy a strategic point in the movement of the cotton from the farm to the factory.

The grade and staple of cotton are influenced by the method of ginning. The cotton merchants and the cotton spinners are complaining that the ginning of American cotton has deteriorated. They assert that the lint is rougher, more gin cut, and more neppy than formerly. They maintain that the fibers are damaged and that the spinning qualities are reduced as a result of improper ginning. There is special complaint that there has been deterioration in the ginning of Delta staple cotton. The Department of Agriculture, as a result of the action of the International Universal Cotton Standards Conference in Washington, D. C., in March, 1929, has established three types or standards for each grade of staple cotton. For instance, there is strict middling, excellent preparation, strict middling, normal preparation, strict middling, fair preparation. The grower is being penalized for inadequate ginning. Cotton is being more carefully graded than heretofore. Standards have been universally adopted. The average annual cotton crop in the United States amounts to approximately 14,500,000 bales. It is conservatively estimated that the cotton growers are losing from three to five dollars a bale annually on account of insufficient and inadequate ginning.

The Department of Agriculture was established to do for the individual what he can not do for himself. It was never the purpose that the Department of Agriculture should engage in business. It is their function to study and investigate and to give the public the benefits of their studies and investigations.

The proposed legislation is peculiarly appropriate. It may be suggested that the manufacturers of ginning machinery could solve the problem. The answer is that the trouble has never been definitely located. There must be further study. There is no available knowledge upon which to base changes in machinery. There is no experimental equipment at hand. A plant must be constructed. There must be a well-equipped machine shop. At first blush, it might be thought that the equipment could be constructed in machine shops that are already available. I repeat, nobody knows what is needed. There must be trial and there must be corrections. There must be changes. As Pascal, the philosopher, has said, the individual or the mechanic must shut himself up in his shop and work, as he invents and discovers. There must be experiments. It is a matter of common knowledge that inventions are not made by the great manufacturing plants but are the result of the dreams and experiments of some individual.

STANDARDS

The Bureau of Standards illustrates the point. The great value of this bureau is that it experiments and invents. The aim is to reduce economic loss. The results are for the public.

As I have said, the Bureau of Standards will cooperate with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the solution of this difficult question. When the machinery has been invented, adjusted, or perfected it will be built by the gin manufacturers. There are mechanical cotton pickers on the market to-day. They have not been produced by the great commercial plants of the country. They have been promoted by the individuals in their shops, where changes could be made promptly, where ideas could be evolved, and where developments could be utilized.

The Delta Experiment Station, located at Stoneville, Miss., is probably the best equipped agricultural experiment station in the South. It is the pride of the Mississippi Delta. Mr. W. E. Ayres is the capable and efficient director of the Delta Station and for some years has studied the problem of cotton ginning. He has brought the matter to the attention of the Department of Agriculture. He has cooperated with Dr. Arthur W. Palmer, of the cotton division of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Dr. R. W. Webb, cotton technologist, Dr. B. Youngblood, principal economist, Office of Experiment Stations, Washington, D. C., Mr. S. H. McCrory, chief of the division of agricultural engineering, and with Mr. Charles A. Bennett, assistant mechanical engineer of the division of agricultural engineering, in an effort to eliminate the losses resulting from improper ginning. In fact, Mr. Ayres first brought the matter to my attention. It was because of the campaign conducted by him that for some time I have endeavored to impress upon the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and upon Congress the importance of further investigations.

LOSSES

In 1929 Mr. Ayres took the matter up with the buyers of Delta cotton, in an effort to ascertain the loss due to improper ginning. The average of 23 estimates by these buyers indicated that an average of \$15 a bale is the loss to the Delta farmer through rough ginning of green or wet cotton, to say nothing at all of the shortening of the staple.

It has been estimated that one-third, or 300,000 bales, of the Delta crop are ginned roughly annually at a loss of about \$4,500,000 to the growers. The losses are also increased by the shortening of the staple. It is estimated that 90 per cent of the Delta crop is being shortened from one thirty-second to one-sixteenth of an inch at the gin. This applies to both public and private gins. It is estimated that the cotton growers of the South lose annually fifty millions of dollars because of improper ginning.

Emphasis is being placed upon purebred cotton and better methods of cultivation. Longer staples are being advocated. There must be improvement in American cotton. We have increased our production. We must increase our grade and staple. Rayon is fast becoming a competitor of cotton. There is just as much difference between the rayon of to-day and the rayon of 25 years ago as there is between the appearance of the Ford car of to-day and the Ford car of 25 years ago. The quality of rayon is increasing. It is becoming more and more a competitor of cotton every day. The quality of cotton must be improved if the farmer is to keep pace with his competitor.

The spinner is interested in properly ginned cotton. Every speck of seed, every short fiber, and every nep has to be taken out by the cotton-mill machinery before the yarn is acceptable in its highest form. Much yarn is rejected on account of neppy cotton. In the very nature of the case, the spinner can not pay as much for poorly ginned cotton, where his fabric will be defective, as he can for adequately prepared cotton.

While it is true that the producer and the consumer are both interested, it is obvious that the losses, because of inadequate and improper ginning, fall heaviest upon the farmer. It is nothing short of a tragedy, when planting seed is carefully selected, the land properly cultivated, and the cotton carefully picked, that in the final stage of the movement from the field to the factory so much damage should be done at the gin.

The proposed legislation will enable the efficient farmer to help himself. While the damages to long-staple cotton, on account of inadequate ginning, are more pronounced than the injury to short cotton, it is proposed to establish the plant at a location that will be available to both long and short cotton. Personally, I believe that the investigations of the gin machinery will be productive of other beneficial results. Enormous savings would accrue to the cotton grower if the commercial bale took up less space. Proper pressing is important.

FIBER RESULTS

The appropriations already made by Congress for studies in cotton ginning have already borne fruit. The results obtained show that every sample of cotton thus far tested is composed of many different lengths. The percentage of different lengths varies in samples of the same staple length and there is wide variation in samples of different staple lengths, which depend upon the variety of cotton, growing conditions, and ginning.

There is marked uniformity of fiber lengths in the hand pulled or separated sample, and there is a decreased uniformity of fiber lengths in the saw-gin sample. The hand method gives the better result.

LABORATORY METHODS

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics is utilizing laboratory methods and employs a sorting machine in arraying different lengths and in measuring and in weighing fibers under proper humidity conditions. The fibers removed by hand, by the small roller gin, and by the large commercial gin, are arrayed separately and records of different lengths are made.

SPINNING TESTS

I have had occasion, not only to observe the laboratory methods and the fiber studies, but I have visited the cotton division of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and observed the spinning tests that are being conducted to determine the spinning qualities of lint cotton, whose qualities were changed by known conditions of ginning. There has been cooperation with other Federal departments, with the experiment stations, and with the agricultural colleges, as well as with public and private gins, and with the manufacturers of ginning machinery and cleaning equipment, in an effort to improve ginning conditions that will result in better fibers, with more uniform spinning qualities.

There is a place for the engineer and for the fiber scientist in the solution of the question. All of the gin work now being conducted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is being done in cooperation with the division of agricultural engineering in the Bureau of Public Roads.

INFORMATION

It is regrettable that there is a lack of scientific data relating to gin machinery and to the organization and operation of gins. There has been much discussion. Some facts have been ascertained but much is yet to be learned. There is a growing demand for information with respect to correct cotton ginning. The public ginner is the servant of the farmer and he is interested to increase the income of the farmer. There are many breaks in the chain of information now available. Little is known about the effects of different mechanical devices for cleaning and ginning on the spinning qualities of the ginned lint. Less is probably known as to the influence of various cleaning and ginning processes on the fibers, staple length, and the moisture content. In the very nature of the case, answers to these and many other questions can only be supplied by systematic and scientific experiments, to be conducted in the proposed experimental gin plant.

THE PROBLEM

There is a problem in cotton ginning and both the producer and the consumer are interested in its solution. The cotton grower, the ginner, the gin manufacturer, and the textile operator would be benefited by the proper solution of the problem. It is a national question. The solution will benefit not only the cotton-growing States but the country at large. Many problems present themselves, such as density of the gin roll, speed of the saws, the moisture in raw cotton, saw-tooth projection over breast roll, the manner of sharpening, and the positions of the teeth on the saws, types and adjustment of cleaning equipment, and other related factors.

I can not overemphasize that ginning is almost as important as breeding in cotton production. The results of years of careful selection and improvement in varieties of seed may be nullified at the gin.

The farmer can solve some of the problems while other questions must be settled at the gin. Inadequate machinery is not the only difficulty. The farmer can help. He can contribute to the elimination of rough or gin-cut cotton. The cotton house in the field has almost entirely disappeared. Cotton is picked and emptied into the wagon. The first cotton picked in the morning is wet with dew and is put into the bottom of the wagon. It never has a chance to dry out. There is small wonder that when it reaches the gin that it is gin cut. Cotton mills are complaining bitterly with respect to rough cotton. Loss in spinning value is excessive and rough cotton, as well as neppy cotton, makes very defective yarn. The cotton house gives an opportunity for the green cotton to dry and an opportunity for all cotton to dry before it is carried to the gin. The farmer can help the ginner. It is impossible to gin wet or green cotton well or fast.

I want to be practical and helpful. While experiments are being conducted and machinery being improved, I call attention to the causes that intensify the problem and result in great losses to the farmer:

First. At the beginning of the cotton season cotton is delivered to the gin when it is too green. There is too much haste in converting the crop into cash. It should be dried. Cotton

houses can be used by the farmer, and drying machinery by the ginner. Mr. Charles A. Bennett, assistant mechanical engineer, to whom I have already referred, is an accomplished and practical mechanic and engineer. He has installed several drying equipments in connection with Delta ginneries during the past season. They will be of material benefit, not only in handling the cotton that is first picked but in drying the cotton after inclement weather.

Second. Too much cotton that is either wet from dew or rain is carried to the gin. The farmer can remedy the situation. The cotton house can be used to advantage, but the probability is that it will be more economical for drying equipments to be installed in cotton gins. I am watching the experiments in cotton drying being conducted by Mr. Bennett with a great deal of interest. There is a field for improvement in all cotton by drying. It will benefit not only the green and sappy cotton but the wet and damp cotton. During the season of 1929 two bales of early green cotton in the Mississippi Delta from the same field were carried to the gin. The first bale was dried in about 30 minutes and at a cost of about a dollar in the cotton drier. The second bale was ginned without drying and sold for 3 cents less per pound than the first bale.

Third. Gins are running too fast. There is too much capacity even with dry cotton. A ginnery is turning out 50 bales when it should be turning out only 30 bales a day. Efficiency is being sacrificed to speed. The farmer is losing. It is not necessarily too much saw speed, but a tight roll and high speed means injury to the staple. Dry cotton is being ginned too fast.

Fourth. The fuzz or seed coat is being cut from the seed. Neps result and there is much loss to the grower. These neps are not the cotton fibers, but they are formed from the fuzz that should remain on the seed. Spinners can pay more for cotton without the fuzz. The oil mill can pay more for the seed with the fuzz on it, as it makes better linters. The grade of the bale is frequently injured by the desire of the ginner to increase the turnout.

Fifth. The matter of cleaning cotton is a no less important or delicate process than the matter of ginning cotton. If the machinery is not properly constructed, the operation of cleaning may very materially affect the spinning qualities of the ginned lint. It is always better to pick cotton by hand, if possible. Machine picking means a poorer grade. Leaves, stems, burs, and foreign matter materially reduce the grade. Rainy weather conditions, of course, account for deteriorations. Snapping and sledding increase the problems of cotton ginning. In many cases if hand-picked cotton is run through cleaners, injury results, for the fibers are damaged. The spinning qualities are reduced in an effort to improve the grade.

CONCLUSION

Much progress has been made in the preliminary gin studies, but further progress is hampered by the necessity of using commercial-type gins, which do not afford the range of conditions, the flexibility of adjustment, or the humidity control needed in scientific work.

Further experiments are necessary and additional facilities and equipment especially designed to permit the easy variation and control of the large number of conditions are important.

An experimental gin plant and equipment, with air-conditioning apparatus and uniform humidity, would clear up many questions about which there is now much discussion and result in improvement in the quality of ginning. The proposed legislation will provide for an experimental gin plant, equipped with adequate temperature and humidity control, and with all types of commercial and experimental ginning and cleaning equipments. The needed facilities for an effective attack upon the problem of cotton ginning will be provided. Better cotton ginning will result, and there will follow a general improvement in the cotton crop that will increase the income of the cotton grower by reducing the losses now sustained by reason of inadequate and insufficient ginning.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 244, authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held October 4 to October 11, 1930, inclusive.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who is going to pay the expense of this conference?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. The oil industry has always paid the expense of it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is certain that we will not have this situation occur again: Several years ago we passed a resolution recognizing an exposition in Philadelphia and were told that the Government would not be called upon to pay any of the expense. Later on we found that the people who urged the passage of the original resolution were pressing very hard for an appropriation running into millions of dollars, and the Government did appropriate millions of dollars over the protest of some of us. I want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma whether in the future there is any possibility that the Congress will be called upon to make an appropriation to take part in the conference and then be told at that time that it is a moral obligation because Congress recognized the conference when we passed this House Joint Resolution No. 244.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. I believe nothing could be more easily answered than the gentleman's question. This exposition has been conducted on a number of occasions and similar resolutions have been passed. We pay our way down there. We are not like some of these older States.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, the thought that the gentleman from Wisconsin expressed has also been in my mind. I have here an amendment which I am ready to offer, the same as I offered to a resolution some time ago for the Chicago Exposition, to the effect that "the Government of the United States is not by this resolution obligated to any expense in connection with the holding of the exposition and will not hereafter be so obligated except for suitable representation thereat."

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the independent oil producers take part in this conference, or will the conference be confined to the Standard, the Dutch Shell, and the Sinclair oil monopoly, which was very happy indeed when the members of another body rejected a protective tariff on oil which the independent oil producers were demanding?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. The exposition is open to everyone and is participated in by everyone. It is world-wide, and every phase of the industry is shown. It is an educational matter.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The only purpose of this resolution is to give it a national status, so that the State Department may issue invitations to other countries to attend.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. That is all that is involved—asking other governments to come here and participate in the exposition.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the strong argument of the proponent of the resolution, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. O'CONNOR], who is one of the most able, diligent, efficient, and useful Members of the House, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 244

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation, or in such other manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and all foreign countries to participate in the proposed International petroleum exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., from October 4 to October 11, 1930, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting samples of fabricated and raw products of all countries used in the petroleum industry and bringing together buyers and sellers for promotion of trade and commerce in such products.

SEC. 2. All articles that shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at the international petroleum exposition upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted free of the payment of duty, customs fees, or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during the exhibition to sell any goods or property imported for and actually on exhibition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: Provided, That all such articles when sold or withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling and necessary exposure, the duty, if paid, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal for consumption or use, and the penalties prescribed by law shall be enforced against any person guilty of any illegal sale, use, or withdrawal.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, after line 24, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 3. That the Government of the United States is not by this resolution obligated to pay any expense in connection with the holding of such exposition, and is not hereafter to be so obligated, other than for suitable representation thereat."

The amendment was agreed to, and the House joint resolution, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the House joint resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

BOISE NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4189) to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I hope I shall not be obliged to do it—this bill adds 150,000 acres of land to a national forest. Whenever we want to take a little piece of land out of a national forest to add to a national park, the national forest people claim to us that it has got to be paid for, that it has certain value on their books, that certain income is to be received, that the counties will get certain income to be used for roads, and so forth, so that the result is that we have hardly a national park where the boundaries have been straightened out as they ought to be. I will say this, that the present administration of the National Forest Service is much broader minded now than was formerly the case. There will not be as much ground for criticism in this as formerly, I am inclined to hope, under the administration of Major Stuart. But in order to keep the books straight, if they are going to keep books on this proposition, I offer an amendment on page 5, line 23, after the word "act," to insert the following:

Provided further, That on the books of the Forestry Service there shall be set up a credit for such lands, to be repaid by transfer of like amount of other national-forest lands, where essential for national-park purposes as may be at any time determined by Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, while I am the author of the bill, I will ask my colleague [Mr. FRENCH] to explain the situation.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I do not see any serious objection to the amendment, though I hope the gentleman from Michigan will not press it upon the pending bill, as there is no national park within the area affected.

Mr. CRAMTON. When there is an occasion where the national park people would like to take a little piece of land out of a national forest, the national forest people are not very quick to come up to the mark. A year ago I think I would have pressed this amendment. But the national forest administration is better now than it was then, and I hope for better things. Therefore, in response to the eloquent appeal of my very good friend from Idaho, I shall not press the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice the justification for taking in all this large acreage is the fact that the public lands are now being used by private interests in grazing, and the consequent injury to the land by the herds impairing the surface.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; and serious erosion is occurring.

Mr. STAFFORD. For some years past I have been acquainted with the large profits made by the range holders using the public domain for their special benefit. Can the gentleman give us an idea as to how much of the public domain is used by these ranch holders with their flocks of sheep herding on the public range?

Mr. FRENCH. The public domain of the United States that is available for public use, unregulated and uncontrolled, is approximately 235,000,000 acres. The land that is referred to in the pending bill is almost an infinitesimally small part of that area. It is my hope that as the result of the study that will be made by the Public Domain Commission, which has been appointed by the President, and for which this House has passed a resolution authorizing appropriation for expenses, a program for adequate control will be worked out touching the surface rights generally. Here I am seeking control of a limited area only embraced within the watershed of the Arrowrock Reservoir.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that these large sheep owners have caused their flocks to graze over the public domain without any opposition.

Mr. FRENCH. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. That condition has been repeatedly called to the attention of Congress, dating back to Roosevelt's time. I will ask the gentleman whether any recent action has been considered by the committee as to the taking over of this large domain by these ranch holders for their personal aggrandizement and to the great injury to the lands; all without the payment of a penny for such use?

Mr. FRENCH. Bills have been introduced from year to year, looking to control—I have a bill pending at this time—but up to the present it has not been possible to obtain the support of the Congress in the enactment of legislation, and therefore it has been necessary sometimes to bring in piecemeal legislation to take care of critical situations such as this.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know of any bill ever reported to any body of Congress that sought to regulate the use of the public domain by the millionaire ranch holders of the West.

Mr. FRENCH. My bill has not been reported. I do not know whether or not the bill of the gentleman from Utah has ever received the approval of his committee. But sentiment has been developing looking to the correction of the situation. I am glad to say that in many of the range States that sentiment is growing. Personally, I have long felt that it is imperative that corrective legislation of general character should be enacted. Unfortunately all States of the West have not been in accord upon this subject.

Mr. LEAVITT. This land has been used in the past in such a way without regulation, but under this bill it will come within the area of the national forest.

Mr. STAFFORD. The purpose of this bill is to restrict this land which has heretofore been used by the large owners of the range herds as they have been doing for the past quarter century?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes. We passed in this House not long ago, and later there was passed in the Senate, a bill making an authorization to cover the expenses of this commission to look into the entire subject of these public lands belonging to the Nation.

The gentleman will recall that the Members from the West, from the public-land States, were largely those who led the fight on the floor of the House for the enactment of that legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is problematical, in my mind, why, with this strong cooperative sympathy on the part of the Representatives from the West, some legislation has not in all of these years been brought out on the floor of the House.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield gladly to the gentleman who controls the policy of the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman will recall that for five or six years there has been such legislation pending before the Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman means in committee, not in the House.

Mr. COLTON. Yes; in the committee. Heretofore it has been almost impossible to get anything like a united sentiment among the Members from the West. But that condition is disappearing and the very men to whom the gentleman is referring, who have used these lands in the past, recognize that we are ruining the lands by overgrazing, and they are asking for action. I am glad that the gentleman himself is interested. I want to bring out this legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been interested in this for the last 25 years, and I know the robber barons of the West who have been appropriating these lands for their own selfish ends have throttled all regulatory legislation in the committees, so that it never saw the light of day on the floors of Congress.

Mr. COLTON. It has been difficult to arouse any public sentiment on this matter. I have delivered several speeches and the membership of the House have seemed indifferent to the entire proposition. I am glad that interest is being awakened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection, but approve the purpose of this bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands are hereby added to the Boise National Forest, Idaho, and made subject to all laws applicable to national forests:

Sections 2 to 11, inclusive; sections 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, and 26, township 2 south, range 9 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 2, 3, 10, 11, and 12, township 1 south, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive; north half northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter and lots 1, 4, and 5, section 6; sections 7 to 26, inclusive; and sections 35 and 36, township 1 south, range 8 east, Boise meridian.

All of township 1 south, range 9 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 32, inclusive, township 1 south, range 10 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 3, 4, 5, and 6, township 1 south, range 11 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, east half sections 6 and 7; sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, east half section 18; sections 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35, and 36, township 1 north, range 6 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1, 2, 3, 7; east half east half northwest quarter and lots 1, 2, 5, and 6, section 10; sections 11, 12, 13, 14, northeast quarter northeast quarter and lots 1, 4, 5, and 6, section 15; sections 18, 19, 20, northeast quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter and lots 1, 4, 5, and 9, section 23; north half and lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 24; and sections 29 to 33, inclusive, township 1 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

North half section 5; sections 6 and 7; sections 13 to 18, inclusive; all of section 19 excepting lot 4; sections 20 to 29, inclusive; north half northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter and lots 1, 5, 6, and 11, section 30; east half southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter and lots 1, 6, 7, and 10, section 31; and sections 32 to 36, inclusive, township 1 north, range 8 east, Boise meridian.

Section 1; sections 11 to 36, inclusive, township 1 north, range 9 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; sections 16 to 36, inclusive, township 1 north, range 10 east, Boise meridian.

South half township 1 north, range 11 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, and sections 17, 18, 19, 20, 29, and 30, township 1 north, range 12 east, Boise meridian.

Section 1; east half sections 2 and 11; sections 12 and 13; and east half section 14, township 2 north, range 4 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 28, inclusive; east half section 29; and section 36, township 2 north, range 5 east, Boise meridian.

Section 1; northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter and lots 3, 4, 6, 7, and 10, section 2; sections 5 to 9, inclusive; lot 1, section 11; east half, northeast quarter northwest quarter and lots 2, 4, 7, and 10, section 12; east half and lots 2, 5, 8, and 11, section 13; sections 16 to 21, inclusive; northwest quarter northeast quarter and lots 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11; section 24; lots 1 and 4, section 25; and sections 27 to 35, inclusive, township 2 north, range 6 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 3 to 28, inclusive; north half, north half southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter and lots 1, 2, 3, section 29; north half and lots 3, 4, 5, and 6, section 30; lots 1 and 2, section 32; north half north half and lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, section 33; and sections 34, 35, and 36, township 2 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 7, 16, 18, 19, 21; southwest quarter section 22; west half section 27; sections 28, 29, 30, 31, 32; north half section 33; and northwest quarter section 34, township 2 north, range 8 east, Boise meridian.

South half section 25; and section 36, township 2 north, range 9 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21; and sections 28 to 33, inclusive, township 2 north, range 10 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 31 to 36, inclusive, township 2 north, range 12 east, Boise meridian.

East half and southwest quarter section 14; east half section 23; sections 24 and 25; east half sections 26 and 35; and section 36, township 3 north, range 4 east, Boise meridian.

All of township 3 north, range 5 east, Boise meridian.

Section 6 and south half of township 3 north, range 6 east, Boise meridian.

North half section 30 and south half section 32, township 3 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

South half section 1; sections 2, 3, 10; north half sections 11 and 12; sections 15, 16, 21, 22, 27, 28, 33, and 34, township 3 north, range 10 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 4 and 5; south half section 6; and north half section 7, township 3 north, range 11 east, Boise meridian.

Southwest quarter section 19; west half sections 30 and 31; northeast quarter south half section 32; and sections 33 and 36, township 4 north, range 5 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 13, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31, township 4 north, range 6 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 7, 8, and 18, township 4 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 4, 8, 9, 15, 16, 21, 27, 28, and 34, township 4 north, range 10 east, Boise meridian; not heretofore included within the Boise National Forest, Idaho, all ranges east Boise meridian: *Provided*, That the inclusion of these lands in the Boise National Forest shall not

affect adversely any valid entry or settlement claim existing prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOUSE RIVER, N. DAK.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10017) to provide for a survey of the Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to the prevention and control of its floods.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are two or three bills of like character on the Consent Calendar. I would like to know what the procedure may be for these surveys for flood relief. We passed a general law in 1927, but it was not a very good law. Some of the gentlemen, anxious to get the bill passed, would not cooperate to make it a good law. But that is a thing of the past. Is the system going to be to bring in one stream at a time for survey, and then when you get your survey, costing \$14,000 or \$15,000, propose a project costing several million dollars? How are we to consider this great flood-relief problem intelligently or comprehensively?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has asked the very questions that I had in mind. I am not against the bill, but I want to know what policy the Flood Control Committee is going to establish in matters of this kind. The act of 1927 enumerated some 200 rivers providing for flood control, irrigation, power investigation, and for navigation. I understand the Board of Engineers of the War Department is making these surveys, and I judge from this report that it has made a preliminary survey and examination and has reached the conclusion that this is a local project. If the Committee on Flood Control is going to sponsor legislation like this, I want to know it, because I am in the same position as the gentleman from North Dakota. I have a project that came within that group of rivers that was surveyed, and it is local in its nature, and I would like to know if they are going to take up bills like this.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I will say to the gentleman from New York and also to the gentleman from Georgia that this particular river was not contained in the general legislation. It does not belong properly to any of the river systems of the country which were taken in, in a general way, by the flood control bill.

It is a stream which rises in Canada and comes down into the United States for about 150 miles and then runs back into Canada. Consequently, it was not properly before the Army engineers, or at least the Army engineers so considered, as a river to be in the general legislation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What are the rights of Canada now, if you are going to divert its flow?

Mr. SINCLAIR. We are not going to divert its flow, but we are going to try to take care of the property that it destroys in this country, and ascertain if some means can not be devised by the Army engineers to take care of property that is being destroyed on this side of the line.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The justification for this bill is based upon the fact that this river was not included in the act of 1927 that embraced a great many rivers throughout the country?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is no policy to take rivers enumerated in the act of 1927, on which adverse reports have been reached, and ask for a survey?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Not at all. Those are being taken care of as the Army engineers reach them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was my great pleasure in the campaign of 1896 in speaking for the sound-money cause and gold monometalism—

Mr. SINCLAIR. 1896? The gentleman is going back a long way.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am antediluvian in my service with the Republican Party—to visit Minot and spend a delightful weekend at the home of a State senator whose home bordered on the stream under consideration, the Mouse. It is a small, peaceful flowing river that gave no evidence of ever reaching any flood proportion. If I thought this survey was going to be the basis of national appropriation for some local purpose, I would feel compelled to object. The district engineer says it is local in its

character. The division engineer, however, says that the survey should be undertaken by the National Government. A survey is one thing. The conditions that apply on the Milwaukee River, navigable in character, but not international, are much more dangerous with respect to floods than this little stream, the Mouse. Is it the purpose of the gentleman from North Dakota to follow this up by having the United States Government build some construction works to protect Minot because once in every 8 or 10 years the stream reaches a flood stage as it comes down from Saskatchewan?

Mr. SINCLAIR. In answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin I will say what future action I will take will depend on what the survey discloses. The facts of the matter are that there are no persons or individuals or groups of engineers that we can properly approach to do this work other than the United States Army Engineers.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what impressed me when I was reading the report, that the little city of Minot, of some 15,000 people—

Mr. SINCLAIR. Oh, 18,000 or 20,000, and one of the leading commercial centers of the Northwest.

Mr. STAFFORD. Or 50,000, did not have the facilities to make this investigation and called upon the Corps of Engineers of the National Government for a survey, and for that reason, I did not intend to interpose objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. In view of the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin went out to the Mouse River back in 1896 in the interest of the Republican Party—

Mr. STAFFORD. Not only in the interest of the Republican Party but in favor of gold monometalism and against the Bryan crusade for free silver.

Mr. BURTNESS. I think it might be appropriate to call attention to the fact that this river is located in that part of the country where the rivers run north and the Irish vote the Republican ticket.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I know the gentleman wants to be fair with the House. You can not control floods with a blue print and all you will get out of this survey will be a blue print. If your community can not afford to make a survey and you want the Federal Government to do it, is it not reasonable to expect that you will come back to the Federal Government and ask them to regulate your floods and carry on at the expense of the Government such construction as may be necessary?

Mr. SINCLAIR. We certainly would not expect the Government to contribute to the construction of works any more than their proper share. I think there is a duty that the Federal Government owes in handling this particular stream. It is an international stream and we do not know how far we can go in preparing works, and yet that city is being destroyed. Over \$1,000,000 worth of property in that city was destroyed two years ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of the Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to preparing plans and estimates for the cost of such work as may be necessary for the prevention and control of its floods, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917, and the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, contained in House Document No. 282, Seventy-first Congress, second session, and the sum of \$15,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE CUMBERLAND RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10213) granting the consent of Congress to rebuild and reconstruct and to maintain and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Cumberland River, near the town of Burnside, in the State of Kentucky.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 3618, identical with the House bill, and which, I understand, is on the Speaker's desk, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to substitute Senate bill 3618 for the bill called up. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Co., lessee of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, and to its successors and assigns, to rebuild, reconstruct, maintain, and operate its existing railroad bridge and the approaches thereto across the Cumberland River in the county of Pulaski, in the State of Kentucky, near the town of Burnside, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

House bill 10213 was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10248) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Moundsville, W. Va.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River, at or near Moundsville, W. Va., authorized to be built by the Moundsville Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved March 1, 1929, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from March 1, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10258) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice and that it retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice and retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice on page 2 of the committee report there is incorporated a letter from the secretary of the Hawesville & Cannelton Bridge Co., and that in the letter there is a name left blank. Is my information correct that the name which is deleted is the name of the notorious bridge racketeer and speculator, Mr. Elliott?

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Speaker, it is surmised by some that Mr. Elliott is referred to. I have letters from the bridge company stating most emphatically that Mr. Elliott is in no way associated with them in preparing the plans and promoting the work of building this bridge, and that the money so far expended has been raised by the citizens of the community of Cannelton. Further than that I have received a letter from them stating that Mr. Elliott will not be associated with them.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. But he has been associated with them and has, no doubt, already received his handsome profits out of the bridge, has he not?

Mr. DUNBAR. No. Where does the gentleman get such information?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It was at my request that the gentleman from Indiana, the author of this bill, asked that it go over without prejudice. Mr. Elliott made a statement

before the State's attorney of Maryland while on the stand there in a fraud order case that he owned this franchise. I found, in the case of a bill introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUTLER], that Elliott was in on the bridge in Oregon but they got rid of him. The gentleman from Indiana said the same thing, but I suggested to him that he follow the procedure that the gentleman from Oregon followed and secure affidavits from the people who are promoting the bridge showing that Elliott no longer has any connection with the bridge.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Those affidavits should also show the amount of money he received from the proposition up to the time he left their service.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That will be up to the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana that this bill go over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SAVANNAH RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10291) authorizing the State Highway Board of Georgia, in cooperation with the State Highway Department of South Carolina, the city of Augusta, and Richmond County, Ga., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Savannah River at or near Fifth Street, Augusta, Ga.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute in lieu of the House bill an identical Senate bill (S. 3715), which is now on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to consider the bill S. 3715 in lieu of the bill called up. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the State Highway Board of Georgia, in cooperation with the State Highway Department of South Carolina, the city of Augusta, and Richmond County, Ga., be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Fifth Street, Augusta, Ga., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the State Highway Board of Georgia, the State Highway Department of South Carolina, the city of Augusta, and Richmond County, Ga., all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE WHITE RIVER IN ARKANSAS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10340) granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Calico Rock, Ark.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the White River, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation, at or near Calico Rock, Ark., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE COOSA RIVER IN ALABAMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10461) authorizing Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Coosa River at or near Gilberts Ferry, about 8 miles southwest of Gadsden, in Etowah County, Ala.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object, for the present.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I would like to know the gentleman's reason for objecting.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is a private bridge.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The bridge is to be taken over by the county.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. When?

Mr. ALLGOOD. Immediately upon its construction.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Did the letter which the gentleman showed me refer to this bridge?

Mr. ALLGOOD. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We are to understand, then, that notwithstanding the provisions of the bill, arrangements have been made that on the completion of the bridge it is to be taken over by the county, and you are going through this process by reason of your local laws?

Mr. ALLGOOD. That is it exactly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be and is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Coosa River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Gilberts Ferry, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Alabama, any political subdivision thereof within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation or expropriation, in accordance with the laws of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of 10 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 3. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by the State of Alabama, or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, under the provisions of section 2 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 10 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and the operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 4. The said Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War and with the Highway Department of the State of Alabama a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and at the request of the Highway Department of the State of Alabama shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable cost of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge; for the purpose of such investigation the said Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall make available all of the records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 2 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Ferry," insert "about 8 miles southwest of Gadsden, in Etowah County, Ala."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS WHITE RIVER IN ARKANSAS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10474) granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Sylamore, Ark.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the White River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Sylamore, Ark., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGES IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10526) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges in the State of Tennessee.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, a similar bill to this has been passed by the Senate, and yesterday it was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill and that the Senate bill be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., (a) That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by an act of Congress approved June 20, 1929, to be built across the Cumberland River on the projected Gallatin-Martha Road, between Sumner and Wilson Counties, in the State of Tennessee, by the highway department of the State of Tennessee, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from June 20, 1930.

(b) That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved June 20, 1929, to be built across the Cumberland River between Gainesboro and Granville, in the county of Jackson, in the State of Tennessee, by the highway department of the State of Tennessee, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from June 20, 1930.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER AT WELLSBURG, W. VA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10651) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, what has been the delay in this matter?

Mr. MORGAN. There was some preliminary work done in connection with surveys and construction of abutments. The franchise has been purchased by the Mount Vernon Bridge Co.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman says that preliminary work has been done?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I withdraw the reservation.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va., authorized to be built by an act approved May 14, 1928, and extended March 2, 1929, are hereby extended one year and three years, respectively, from May 14, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, after the word "built" insert the following: "by the J. K. Mahone Bridge Co., its successors and assigns,"; after the word "act" add "of Congress."

Line 6, strike out the words "and extended" and insert in lieu thereof "heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved."

Line 7, after the word "hereby" insert the word "further."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS ROBINS COVE, CHESTER RIVER, MD.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3135) granting the consent of Congress to Helena S. Raskob to construct a dam across Robins Cove, a tributary of Chester River, Queen Annes County, Md.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have the author of the bill tell us something about it. The committee report is very meager. There is not one substantial fact stated in the report.

Mr. BURTNESS. This is only a very minor proposition. It is no power proposition.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. We do not know just what it is.

Mr. BURTNESS. I was on the subcommittee, but I can not recall all of the details of these numerous bills. This is a dam across some little narrow cove of the river and is a simple matter for the convenience of the local people.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the fact that the report does not contain any material facts to show why it should be passed, and we can not obtain the facts on the floor of the House, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE CUMBERLAND RIVER AT OR NEAR SMITHLAND, KY.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3745) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky., authorized to be built by the State Highway Commission, Commonwealth of Kentucky, by the act of Congress approved May 18, 1928, and heretofore extended by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1929, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from May 18, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TENNESSEE RIVER AT MOUTH OF CLARKS RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3747) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River authorized to be built by the State Highway Commission, Commonwealth of Kentucky, by the act of Congress approved May 18, 1928, and heretofore extended by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1929, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from May 18, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADDRESS OF HON. GORDON BROWNING

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including therein a very eloquent address delivered by my colleague, Hon. GORDON BROWNING, on the evening of April 10, 1930, at Johnstown, Pa., to the State convention of Women's Federated Democratic Clubs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The address was as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE THE STATE CONVENTION OF WOMEN'S FEDERATED DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Madam Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the significance of an important era is pictured most perfectly in the biographies of the great contemporaneous characters who shaped it. If you would know the magic of a great cause, that in it which fastens onto and holds the affections of people, study the ideals of its leaders. No different has been the political development of our Nation; and although we had Washington and Franklin and Madison and Henry, each indispensable in our battle for freedom and the launching of our ship of State, it remained for two other characters of that day to fashion and mold the rival political philosophies that have stood at Armageddon from Yorktown to this good hour. I refer, of course, to Hamilton and Jefferson. And their fundamentals of government, with application to our Government in action, are beckoning to us to-day at the crossroads.

Hamilton, though born in obscurity, was one of the most dominating intellects of all time, and at heart was wedded to the idols of class rule as against diffusion of governmental powers among the people. Aneant this view he offered a sketch of government to the Constitutional Convention on June 18, 1787, which embodied his imperialistic ideas. It provided for a Congress with power to pass all laws whatsoever, subject to absolute veto power in the President, who was to be elected for life or during good behavior. The Senate, elected for life, was to have the sole power of declaring war. The governors of all States were to be appointed for life by the General Government, with absolute power of veto over any act of their State legislature, and every law of a State contrary to a law or the Constitution of the United States was declared void.

No one was eligible to vote for election of the President or the Senate unless he owned a certain amount of property. No skeptical medieval despot could have been more distrustful of the rule of the people than the author of this plan. But when he was defeated and our Constitution was submitted, providing for rule by the people, with a central government of a few delegated powers and all else reserved to the States or to the people, his efforts for its ratification were tremendous and decisive. His partisan biographers concede that the basis of Hamilton's scheme for the success of the Government was to

bring property and wealthy classes to its support with mercenary ties by assuring them an immediate and personal pecuniary profit from its operation. He had failed to write class rule and property domination into the body of governmental structure, but he sought to accomplish the same ends by administration of government. Thus, special privilege and centralization were the cardinal principles of this patron saint of the Republican Party, and to those principles that party to-day adheres in both theory and action.

The system of government adopted was the antithesis of Hamilton fundamentals. It ordained rule by the people, and reserved to them all powers and liberties not expressly surrendered through the Constitution to the common necessity. The old order insisted that the people were incapable of intelligent exercise of these powers, and must be governed by overlordism. In answer to this, Jefferson laid bare their fallacy when he said:

"Sometimes it is said that man can not be trusted to govern himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others?"

Jefferson, born to the purple, with every encouragement of environment and training to lean toward aristocracy, became the greatest apostle of the common man's vested rights, his ability to govern himself, his right to protection against monopoly, the placing of human rights above property rights; in short, the exponent of true Americanism.

Standing on these fundamentals, the Democratic Party, marshaled by Jefferson, began the struggle for the people against organized and privilege-seeking greed, which struggle has continued unabated to now. Those of his convictions had written the Constitution, and he laid down the policy in administration of holding wide open the door of opportunity to all classes of people; of stimulating growth and self-reliance by placing on the people themselves the obligation and necessity to govern.

The statement that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," was never more conclusively proven than in the experience of our people. When the people periodically wrest their heritage from the invisible usurpers it is a habit in them to then relax in a false sense of security. That is when selfish interests intrigue and scheme to recapture control. Andrew Jackson found this process at work when he came to power on a wave of popular uprising against class rule. The Bank of Nicholas Biddle was the embodiment and directing force of this sinister control over Government. Jackson did not temporize with it, or quibble over a course of action. He saw an octopus holding in its embrace the machinery of Government. He destroyed it and gave a rebirth to popular rule. He was the sword of Jeffersonian Democracy, dauntless in courage, lofty in patriotism, and unbending in will. Because of his example and accomplishments we may to-day take courage in the impending struggle to restore once more their Government to the people.

Hamilton's theories have come down to us through the vehicles of the Federalist, the Whig, and the Republican Parties. Under the rule of the latter for more than 50 years they have had their fullest fruition in corruption as the inevitable consequence of favoritism in government. Throughout its history at only two brief intervals, under Lincoln and Roosevelt, has the Republican Party tried to appear at ease in the stolen garb of Democracy; but it has never been able to conquer its yearning for the old regalia of stripes worn by it so much more becomingly. Lincoln no more belonged to that system than did Jefferson fit in with the Federalistic theories. And had Lincoln lived he would have been the target for the same cruel shafts that struck the armor of old stout-hearted Andrew Johnson. When the assassin's bullet found its mark, Thad Stevens and his ilk were brewing the hemlock which they hoped to press to the lips of the great liberator. But upon his demise those who hated him, yet were controlled by a stronger passion, that of an "immediate and personal pecuniary interest" in the favors of government, were quick to reckon the value of his martyrdom for a moral cause and the force of the sectional hatred they could build around it. So they tacked his banner to their masthead and sailed forth to plunder the gullible and the helpless. Ever since then their war emblem has been the "Bloody Shirt," but their war aim has been booty. Since 1861 their leaders have sought, and largely succeeded in linking the Democratic Party and secession and bloody Civil War together as a screen to conceal their real purpose of getting, through administration of government, that which they have no legal or moral right to, namely, favors at the expense of merely ordinary citizens. It was uncovered in the multitudinous scandals under Grant, Harding, and others, the theft of a Presidency from Tilden, the free rein to plunder given the favored throughout their party's history.

But, to establish this charge we do not have to revert to ancient political history. We do not even have to rely on the recent chapter of thievery under the "Harding gang," that mantled the face of America with the blush of shame. They only grew a little crude and careless. Their code was the time-honored one promulgated by the national Republican organization years before this debacle, and the one yet in force. That is why not a single leader of the Harding, Coolidge, or Hoover administrations has condemned the thieves or the thieveries. To them the offense was not in the crimes against the people; it rested solely in their having been caught.

The trend toward centralized power in Washington under the Republican rule has gone on apace, till now we have 600,000 Federal employees, with less than 600 of them elected by the people. The others

are removed two or three times from responsibility to anyone who votes. They are reckless in disregard of liberty since they have no responsibility for it, they undertake to supervise personal conduct, and think they should order the life of each citizen from the cradle to the grave. This results from the necessity that Congress has when it assumes jurisdiction of every phase of regulation which should be left to the States and to the communities to delegate the administration of its laws to bureaus whose agents swarm over the land to plague and consume.

Sad and gloomy is our path if our people are to be driven to surveillance, robbed of initiative and responsibility. The genius of our peculiar society lies in the necessity of the people to govern. Without it no leadership can develop, no progress will cheer us. Our hope is in self-reliance, not in paternalism. Our political structure was built on the liberty and responsibility of the citizen, not for his regulation.

I maintain that the manipulations of the Treasury Department under Mr. Mellon have been such as to arouse the justified suspicion of deceptive design and rank favoritism. But they are so typical of Republican administration! When he wanted to defeat the adjusted-compensation measure he willfully made an error of \$1,000,000,000 in the estimate of the Treasury receipts for one year. This was the first time a Secretary of the Treasury ever missed a yearly estimate of receipts more than \$25,000,000. That is only one of the many instances of deceptive design. As to rank favoritism, under his administration, and up to last year, \$2,800,000,000 had been given back in taxes to the large favored corporations in the form of refunds and abatements of moneys collected on their own returns under the Wilson administration. Some of the fabulous sums now being paid back in this way are for collections beyond the year 1917. A large part of the most recent "charities" of this nature went to Pennsylvania corporations. In July, 1928, Mr. Andrew Mellon sat as Secretary of the Treasury on one side of the table with Mr. Andrew Mellon of the Aluminum Trust on the other side, agreed to and did refund \$1,287,426 in back taxes to the Aluminum Co. with the sole comment, "It was an inventory adjustment." Since 1925 the United States Steel Corporation has received approximately \$100,000,000 in this manner.

In 1919, through an error, I was forced to pay \$4.50 income tax on my 1917 Army salary, which was exempt. When I inquired of that I am politely advised that the statute of limitations has long since run against its refund. But corporations have no trouble reopening their claims for millions back to that year. They seem to know the combination. It is presumptuous for a mere citizen to expect any such consideration or attention.

I have no doubt many of these cases are reopened on invitation or suggestion. Big business owns this Government under Republican rule. Mellon treats with arrogant contempt the clamor of the Democratic leaders for him to show the public a record of these surreptitious "settlements." He cares not what you think of his ethics in dealing with himself and friends; his logic is that they bought a controlling interest in the Government through campaign contributions, therefore should be allowed to partition as spoils that which they own. That is Republican rule.

Mergers, consolidations, combines are forming to such an extent that monopoly is becoming our national policy. The Sherman antitrust law and other measures designed to curb monopoly are being looked upon as relics of an age when we had some regard for individual rights and interests as opposed to corporate greed. The Federal Trade Commission and other agencies set up by the Democrats for the protection of the public have been deliberately "stacked" to defeat their original purposes. Big business, as such, may be with us to stay. It will either be master or servant. We must control it, if at all, by forced competition or by regulation. It is imperative that the people have a voice in that control. They will never have it so long as the very interests to be regulated name the commissions and dictate their activities. If the Federal Trade Commission by chance should expose a flagrant violation of the laws and court decrees against monopoly, as it did in the merger of the Aluminum Co. with the Duke interests, some Mellon on the inside administers an opiate to the Attorney General and the travesty is left exposed but unmolested. The case made out against the Aluminum Co. was dismissed on April 4 without comment.

It was stated at a recent bankers' convention, without challenge, that 80 per cent of the capitalization of all the banks in the Nation is now held by 12 financial concerns. These 12 concerns have a working understanding, no doubt, with power to dominate or crush all independent institutions. All industries are traveling the same road, passing at will, and unchallenged, those who are supposed to be the sentinels of our liberties. Greed has a taste of profit and can not listen to the counsels of wisdom. Its motto is "Let things be unrestrained, though the result is the destruction of man."

The forces now driving us to inevitable reform or revolution are blind, for the people will some day rise in righteous wrath and smite them, even if, like Samson, they bring the temple down on their own heads. In my judgment, they are ready to right the wrongs without resort to radical measures. But any worthy cause must have stalwart

leaders. What we need is a Jefferson, a Jackson, or a Wilson. What a pitiful comparison to them would be our last three Presidents! Harding and Coolidge were acceptable to those in control only because they would obey implicitly. The present occupant does not even know how to obey.

If uncertainty of mind and timidity of soul are qualities of leadership, Herbert Hoover is a born leader. Sound legal opinion will hold with the view that an election is a contract between the people and the party chosen President for a term of four years. And without doubt an action could now be sustained in any court of equity in the land to cancel that contract with him on the grounds of failure of consideration on his part. Were I bringing the suit, I would rest my case after filing a certified copy of his official accomplishments.

There is an old common-law writ known as *audita querela* by which even a judgment defendant can be relieved if he shows developments after judgment that would make it unconscionable to enforce it. Undoubtedly it was just such predicaments in which the whole American people find themselves enmeshed to-day that provoked the origin of that rule. A majority of those voting for President Hoover did it in good faith, and I submit that in equity and good conscience even they should not be punished further.

Heralded as a superman with a scientific mind and a definite plan, we inaugurated him with a confession from him and his party that every industry, every activity of the Nation was prosperous and happy except agriculture, which they admitted was languishing under eight years of Republican rule. In addition to the creation of a Farm Board, which has been used only for purposes of persuading the farmers to curtail production, he proposed a limited revision of the tariff in favor of the farmer. It would be as reasonable to contend that one suffering from poison should have a heavy dose of arsenic. But the program was launched, with the result that farm prices have consistently fallen, and a third of our consuming public is thereby financially prostrate. The index price of all staple farm products has fallen 15 points since the creation of the board, with a falling off in production from the last season. The farmer is about to be "relieved" of what little he had left over from the ravages of eight years of Republican prosperity!

No sooner had this "limited revision" begun than the cloven-hoof beats of "Grundism" could be heard rattling on the marble floors of the Republican council chambers. The destitute farmer was used to pry open the door, then was stood up against the wall and shown that he was only to be butchered to make a political holiday for those who own the Government under Republican rule.

The revelries of insatiate greed began, with JOE GRUNDY as master of ceremonies. He warned that those who paid for the election of Hoover had come for a reckoning, and proceeded to dictate the highest program of legalized robbery that ever quickened the dream of avarice. Fifteen Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee sanctioned what GRUNDY told them to write, and a Republican House stultified its honor by doltish compliance, without granting the privilege of amendment. The people were put on notice that their payment of tribute has merely begun. The President was importuned in vain to take a stand against such treachery.

This child of iniquity, designed to serve every interest except the common interest, was escorted to the Senate, where the same arrogant gang of privilege employed the chief lobbyist of the Connecticut Manufacturers' Association and placed him in the executive sessions to nurse it through the committee. It came forth from that committee with many added frills and embellishments, to encounter a coalition formed of the Democrats and those progressive Republicans, who did not feel bound by the Old Guard agreement to permit those who paid the campaign expenses to rob the farmer and the consuming public.

At this point again came a logical demand for the President to make known his position. The Old Guard claimed they represented his views. The Progressives claimed he was with them in standing by his platform. Some of the Democrats made bold to hope he was fair enough to share their views. No term describes the way he faced this great opportunity so well as "groveling." Before they finished the bill in the Senate every faction was denying that they had any connection with the President's views, for if they claimed him defeat was certain, so contemptuous is the general feeling toward him. How the mighty hath fallen! What an auspicious beginning!

"But yesterday the word of Caesar might

Have stood against the world; now lies he there,
And none so poor to do him reverence."

As usual, the effort to write a tariff bill has degenerated into a snarling brawl over the booty. No Democrat wants to injure legitimate business. The time-honored position of our party has been a tariff to cover the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. That is all any honest business wants; it is all any dishonest business ought to have. To carry out this policy, President Wilson procured the creation of a Tariff Commission to determine scientifically these differences. Had this plan been followed, we would have been spared the spectacle of logrolling and deceit we now behold.

Additional reasons for a Democratic tariff are that infant industries no longer exist; we are an export Nation and need foreign markets; we

need the friendship of other peoples who are now retaliating; we are a creditor Nation, and our debtors can only pay in products; an American laborer can produce five times as much as one of his competitors. America can outstrip the world in mass production, and we need foreign markets for our surplus products and farm crops. The destruction of foreign markets for farm surpluses has destroyed the purchasing power of one-third of our consuming public.

It is proposed to add more than a billion dollars to the tariff burden already on the consuming public. Before this is done the people should be reminded that they now pay a yearly tribute of \$4,000,000,000 to the tariff barons who are demanding this increase. They have placed a toll-gate across the portal of every home in the land and have barred with it the doors to the wardrobe and the pantry. You must pay before you enter. The chief merit to be claimed for the present exorbitant system is that it places more than a half billion dollars revenue in the Treasury each year. But it is a rather extravagant system when it costs you \$8 to get one into the Treasury. The farmer will pay \$10 toll for every dollar made effective on his products in this bill.

If prohibitive tariffs can bring prosperity, may I ask what is wrong now? For 10 years we have been protected by a Chinese wall. No tariff before then ever approached the rates now in force. Twenty billions of dollars were wiped away in the most recent panic. Where is this vaunted prosperity? Distress is prevalent throughout the land, and that with a man in the White House who promised to banish poverty from America! Somewhere between 4,000,000 and 10,000,000 men are idle. They and their families are hungry. They want to work.

In a court recently a man who had applied for naturalization was being examined by the judge when the following colloquy took place:

The COURT. Who is President of the United States?

The APPLICANT. Al Smith.

The COURT. Why do you say Al Smith?

The APPLICANT. Well, I was told that if he was elected we would have hard times, and I certainly thought he was, from the times we are having.

A newspaper item announced not long since that "Sam Lomax broke his back last week trying to shoulder a dollar's worth of Hoover oats."

Hard times under Democratic rule; good times under Republican rule! This ancient lie has been repeated so often that some of the most credulous have been made to believe it. How can anyone fall out of the bed when he is already lying on the floor? With the great engineer Hoover in the White House, with a majority of 104 in the House and 16 majority in the Senate; with prosperity in industry proclaimed throughout the Nation; yet in less than a year millions are clamoring for bread and begging for work. From the housetops the administration leaders are shouting "reds" at them. They can see a Bolshevik in every bush; and if they find a man with corns on his hands they look for a bomb concealed under his ragged coat.

How can a man reason when he is being tortured by the pangs of hunger? These conditions are the direct result of the Dives kind of prosperity given us by Republican rule. The Bourbons, preceding the French Revolution, were content with a rule that brought luxury and ease to the nobility. They were disdainful of the empty pots on the hearthstones of the peasants. The consequences were written in the blood tragedy of fearful years.

The Democratic Party has often been called upon in a crisis, and it has never failed to restore the Government to the people when they became surfeited with misrule and corruption. It was done under Jefferson, it was done under Jackson, it was done under Cleveland, and it was done under Wilson. The task now confronting us is to restore honesty in government; to preserve the liberties of the people; to safeguard equality in all privileges of living; to reestablish the necessity and responsibility of self-government by the people themselves. These are the sacred jewels of our heritage, the golden candlesticks and vessels ensconced in a charter of liberties. Well may we bear that charter aloft as we circle the walls of Jericho. And, like the unholy Jew who steadied the Ark of the Covenant, all who dare to raise a profane hand to pollute it should be stricken to earth.

The Democratic Party is the only one that has survived throughout the life of the Nation because it is the only one founded on the ideals of permanent justice and true Americanism. If we could eliminate the false issues and prejudices so often determinative in a national election, we would never lose a battle, for a great majority of the American people in their hearts are Democrats. But somehow they permit the sirens of sordid materialism or the passions of false moral issues to becloud or beguile their judgment. Just as was done in 1928 when a man's religion and a bogus issue of prohibition elected a President who never had an honest intention of enforcing the prohibition law, if we are to judge by a barren record of more than a year in responsibility.

Candidates are as transient as the passing clouds. But the fundamentals of our party are as permanent as the shrines of freedom, as the love of liberty, or the temporal hope of mankind. We do not have to win as a matter of temporary political expediency, but we do have to be true to those ideals. Let us fight the good fight and keep the faith. I have confidence in the ultimate untrammelled judgment of the American people. They are now conscious of the false prophecies and be-

trays of the unfaithful Republican leaders. The responsibility is soon to be ours. May we meet it with a leadership worthy the ideals we profess.

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the following privileged resolution and ask its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 207

Resolved, That JOHN M. WOLVERTON, of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6564) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SMOOT, Mr. JONES, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. McKELLAR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 215. An act to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services," as amended by the act of May 28, 1928; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

BRIDGE ACROSS DETROIT RIVER AT GROSSE ISLE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. 4027, to legalize a bridge across the American channel of the Detroit River leading from the mainland to Grosse Isle, Mich., and about 16 miles below the city of Detroit, Mich. This has been favorably reported from the committee and is on the calendar. It is a free bridge and is an emergency matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent for the consideration of S. 4027. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bridge now being reconstructed by the Board of County Road Commissioners of Wayne County, Mich., across the American channel of the Detroit River, leading from the mainland to Grosse Isle, Mich., about 16 miles below the city of Detroit, Mich., if completed in accordance with plans accepted by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, as providing suitable facilities for navigation, shall be a lawful structure, and shall be subject to the conditions and limitations of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and, in accordance with the order heretofore made (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, April 12, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

For the relief of Frank J. Boudinot (H. R. 5847).

For Monday, April 14, 1930:

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION—SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOSPITALS

(10 a. m.)

To consider proposals for veterans' hospitals in California and Washington.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the expenses of participation by the United States in the International Conference on Load Lines, London, England, 1930 (H. J. Res. 297).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended (H. R. 10478).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

404. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Salmon River, Alaska, with a view to the control of the floods (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

405. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers on survey of the Escambia River, Ala. and Fla., with a view to the control of the floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

406. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment under the Architect of the Capitol for the fiscal year 1931 (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

407. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting five drafts of proposed legislation affecting existing appropriations of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, 1929, and 1930 (H. Doc. No. 344); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

408. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the George Washington Bicentennial Commission for the fiscal year 1931, amounting to \$148,200 (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

409. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1931, amounting to \$50,000 (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

410. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the thirteenth annual report of the Federal Farm Loan Board for the year ended December 31, 1929 (H. Doc. No. 212); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers and illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Committee on Invalid Pensions, H. R. 11588. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 11575) authorizing the construction, maintenance, repair, and preservation of certain public works for the improvement of navigation and the development of power on that section of the St. Lawrence River extending from Lake Ontario to the towns of Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Prescott, Ontario; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLARK of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 11576) to amend section 6, chapter 389, approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555; U. S. C. title 5, sec. 652), entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 11577) to provide for the establishment of a branch home of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 11578) to restore certain persons to their former rank as officers on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 11579) to provide for the partial payment of the expenses of foreign delegates to the Eleventh Annual Convention of the Federation Interalliee Des Anciens Combattants, to be held in the District of Columbia in September, 1930; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 11580) to amend section 1709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stats. 1083), and section 304 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stats. 24); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 11581) to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11582) to provide monuments to mark the birthplaces of deceased Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 11583) for the acquisition of private lands within the exterior boundaries of the Niobrara Reservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 11584) to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 11585) to authorize the President of the United States to lease Muscle Shoals on certain terms and conditions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 11586) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire toll bridges and maintain them as free bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11587) to authorize the acquisition of certain land required by the United States Bureau of Lighthouses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11588) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 11589) to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the present value of their adjusted service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 11590) to amend section 1, act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 11591) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River opposite to or within the corporate limits of Nebraska City, Nebr.," approved June 4, 1872; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11592) providing for the sale of the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ESTERLY: Resolution (H. Res. 206) that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization is authorized to conduct an investigation relative to importation of skilled labor under the immigration act, 1917; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 300) to permit the Pennsylvania Gift Fountain Association to erect a fountain in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Library.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, recommending to Congress the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increase in pension for the veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, recommending to Congress the passage of House bill 2526, providing for an increase of pensions for the veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAIRD: A bill (H. R. 11593) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11594) to amend an act for the relief of Augusta Cornog, approved May 29, 1929; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11595) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11596) granting a pension to Charles C. Pruitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 11597) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia E. Oliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 11598) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 11599) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Sigrist; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11600) granting a pension to Lida I. Slevin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11601) for the relief of William J. Dillon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 11602) for the relief of G. T. Fleming; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11603) for the relief of C. J. Holliday; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11604) for the relief of J. B. Trotter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOYLE: A bill (H. R. 11605) for the relief of Frank Bernard Crilly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 11606) for the relief of Edwin L. Menzer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11607) granting a pension to Lydia Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 11608) for the relief of Jerry Esposito; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 11609) granting an increase of pension to Ann Lowmiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11610) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Page B. Myler, a former rural carrier out of East Liverpool, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 11611) for the relief of Capt. George R. Armstrong, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 11612) granting a pension to Edwin H. McSloy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 11613) granting an increase of pension to Caroline G. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 11614) granting an increase of pension to Tillie E. Shryock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 11615) granting a pension to William Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 11616) granting a pension to Della Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6716. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the officers and members of the Post Office Square Club, urging the passage of the La Follette-Kendall short Saturday workday bill, S. 2540, as they feel that in granting the worker this additional time for a rest and recreation that his efficiency and productivity are greatly increased; and postal employees who perform arduous service and are subjected to the inclemencies of the weather should have the benefit of at least a shorter workday on Saturday in order to give them an opportunity to rest and return to duty on Monday morning refreshed and able to perform their work in such manner as must produce greater efficiency and productivity; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6717. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Memorial of Common Council of Kenosha, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to proclaim October 11 of each year as Pulaski memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6718. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of many citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring Senate bill 1468, to amend the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, by extending its provisions to tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6719. Also, petition of many citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring increased pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6720. By Mr. DEROUEN: Resolution of the common council of the city of Merryville, La., memorializing the Congress of the United States for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 167, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6721. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of A. J. Bell and approximately 50 others, indorsing an increased rate of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6722. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of Rhode Island State Nurses Association, urging support of Goodwin bill, House bill 10574; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6723. Also, petition of Martin W. Law, San Francisco, Calif., in support of House bill 7765—Spanish-American War—payment in lieu of transportation in kind; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6724. Also, petition of Railway Mail Association, Oklahoma City, Okla., in support of House bills 6603 and 3087; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6725. Also, petition of George Minchak, Yonkers, N. Y., in support of Kendall bill providing shorter workday on Saturday for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6726. Also, petition of Joseph Gawler's Sons (Inc.), morticians, District of Columbia, urging enactment of legislation to control sale of narcotics by providing for issuance of specific prescription blanks by physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6727. Also, petition of National Association of Retail Grocers, St. Paul, Minn., in support of House bill 11, Capper-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6728. Also, petition of Southwestern Millers' League, Kansas City, Mo., calling attention to importance of retaining amendment No. 1213 on page 476 of the Senate tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6729. Also, petition of Philadelphia Ocean Traffic Bureau, protesting against enactment of legislation granting consent of Congress to construct and maintain a bridge across the Delaware River at Wilmington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6730. By Mr. HICKEY: Resolution of Warsaw Progress Club, Warsaw, Ind., urging the passage of a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6731. Also, resolution of the East Side Mothers Study Club, Warsaw, Ind., urging the passage of a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6732. Also, resolutions of common council of the city of South Bend, Ind., memorializing Congress to enact House bill 9143, for the payment in full of the face value of adjusted-service certificates and memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 167, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6733. By Mr. KELLY: Petition of citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., favoring increased pensions for veterans of Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6734. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition consisting of individual letters, registering protests against the Federal education bill, and contending that education is a local matter, and not for Government administration, from the following citizens of the third congressional district, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Mary Alstead, Agnes Bradshaw, Charles Carney, Ellen Connolly, Alice Dempsey, Mary Dumlevy, Mrs. M. Fannegan, Johanna Fee, Matthew Flynn, Frank A. Gilbride, James Guidera, P. J. Gunning, Jr., Jennie A. Hemian, Mrs. B. Higgins, Thomas P. Higgins, Mary Howard, Mary E. Keilly, John McDade, Mrs. McDonnell, Mary McGowan, E. McMahon, David Moss, Joseph Moss, Mary E. Murphy, Anna O'Connell, Elizabeth Oggari, Catherine Quinlan, Bridget Reynolds, Mrs. Patrick Ryan, William Shelton, Charles Slickler, Mrs. S. Swain, and William E. Trinkleback; to the Committee on Education.

6735. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of 33 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 8976, for the relief of veterans and widows and minor orphan children of veterans of Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

6736. By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: Petition of citizens of Berry's Lick, Ky., urging passage of bill to increase pensions

of men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6737. By Mr. PITTENGER: Petition of Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., protesting against proposed merger of Great Northern and Northern Pacific Railway Cos.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6738. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition of Mrs. John Ulm, of Dubuque, Iowa, and many other citizens in favor of House bill 2562, providing an increased rate of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6739. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of John H. Donahue and other members of the National Soldiers' Home at Togus, Me., petitioning Congress for a pension for the veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6740. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition signed by Eugene M. Carter and other residents of Jefferson County, Ky., supporting Spanish War veterans' legislation; to the Committee on Pensions.

6741. By Mr. WALKER: Petition signed by Mrs. L. L. Bryant and Mrs. W. B. Poor, of the Danville Union of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking for Federal supervision of motion pictures requiring higher standards before production which are to be used interstate and internationally; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, April 14, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who transcendest all our thoughts of Thee, yet comest to us in the things that are seen, enable us to realize the presence of eternity, that we may wisely employ our time; the nearness of Thy judgment, lest we forget what manner of men we are; the long-suffering of Thy love, lest at thought of Thee we grow afraid. Bring us from our diverse views into the realm of the common truth, from the cares of our self-love to the ardors of self-abnegation, that united to Thee in the fundamental law of duty Thy presence may surround our ignorance, Thy holiness our sin, Thy peace the disquiet of our souls.

Grant this, we beseech Thee, for the sake of Thy Son, who took upon Him our flesh and suffered death upon the cross that all mankind should follow the example of His great humility, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, April 8, 1930, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate:

S. 3618. An act granting the consent of Congress to rebuild, reconstruct, maintain, and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Cumberland River near the town of Burnside, in the State of Kentucky;

S. 3715. An act authorizing the State Highway Board of Georgia, in cooperation with the State Highway Department of South Carolina, the city of Augusta, and Richmond County, Ga., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Savannah River at or near Fifth Street, Augusta, Ga.;

S. 3745. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky.;

S. 3747. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River;

S. 3820. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges in the State of Tennessee; and

S. 4027. An act to legalize a bridge across the American Channel of the Detroit River leading from the mainland to Grosse Isle, Mich., about 16 miles below the city of Detroit, Mich.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1186. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 27, 1906, conferring authority upon the Secretary of the Interior to fix the size of farm units on desert-land entries when included within national reclamation projects;

H. R. 1601. An act to authorize the Department of Agriculture to issue two duplicate checks in favor of Utah State treasurer where the originals have been lost;

H. R. 3246. An act to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in Akron, Ohio;

H. R. 4189. An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest;

H. R. 6343. An act to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the establishment of which is authorized by the act approved May 22, 1926 (44 Stats. p. 616);

H. R. 9761. An act to authorize the issuance of patents in fee for Indian homesteads on the Crow Reservation, the Blackfeet Reservation, and the Fort Belknap Reservation, in the State of Montana, upon written application therefor;

H. R. 9895. An act to establish the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9934. An act providing for the sale of timberland in four townships in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 10017. An act to provide for a survey of the Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to the prevention and control of its floods;

H. R. 10173. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations of cotton ginning;

H. R. 10248. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Moundsville, W. Va.;

H. R. 10340. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Calico Rock, Ark.;

H. R. 10416. An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws;

H. R. 10461. An act authorizing Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Coosa River at or near Gilberts Ferry, about 8 miles southwest of Gadsden, in Etowah County, Ala.;

H. R. 10474. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Sylamore, Ark.;

H. R. 10627. An act to amend the act of February 14, 1920, authorizing and directing the collection of fees for work done for the benefit of Indians;

H. R. 10651. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.;

H. R. 10674. An act authorizing the payment of six months' death gratuity to beneficiaries of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who die while on active duty;

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry," approved February 14, 1920, as amended January 21, 1922, and as extended December 28, 1922;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the use of tribal funds belonging to the Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians in South Dakota to pay expenses and compensation of the members of the tribal business committee for services in connection with their pipestone claim; and

H. J. Res. 244. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held October 4 to October 11, 1930, inclusive.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2719. An act granting the consent of Congress to the superintendent of public works of the State of New York to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River at the southerly extremity of the city of Troy;

S. 3618. An act granting the consent of Congress to rebuild, reconstruct, maintain, and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Cumberland River near the town of Burnside, in the State of Kentucky;

S. 3745. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky.;

S. 3820. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges in the State of Tennessee; and